

THE CHINESE RECORDER AND MISSIONARY JOURNAL.

VOL. 2.

FOOCHOW, SEPTEMBER, 1869.

No. 4.

BUDDHISM IN CHINA.

BY T. WATTERS.

CHAPTER II.

The Confucianist Opposition to Buddhism.

If we ask how is the rapid growth of Buddhism in China to be accounted for, and how is to be explained the pertinacity with which it has retained its existence, notwithstanding the difficulties which have beset it from within and from without, we will receive various answers. A Confucianist explains both by the great love which people have for the marvellous, and the tendency of the multitude sheeplike to go astray after any one who takes the lead. A Protestant missionary again, like Mr. Edkins, answers quite patly, "The Buddhists from India came peaceably, teaching the Chinese to revere their pompous ritual, and their placid, benevolent, and thoughtful divinities. They spread among them the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul, and its transmigration into the bodies of animals. They also pleased their imaginations with splendid pictorial scenes of far away worlds, filled with light, inhabited by Buddhas, Bodhisattwas, and angelic beings, and richly adorned with precious stones and metals. In this way they enticed the Chinese into idolatry."¹ Neither of these suppositions, however, nor both of them together, can satisfactorily explain the advance and permanent establishment of this religion among the Chinese; and an additional and better reason will be found in the excellence of many of its doctrines, and the enthusiasm of its early missionaries. Just as in its external forms, so also in its history, Bud-

dhism presents many points of similarity to Christianity. Each in its origin was an offset from an old religion, the adherents of which abhorred and cast out those of the new. Each made its great conquests, not on its native soil, but among peoples widely different in character and institutions from those which had given it birth. Christianity came over to Western Europe, preached by men of lively faith and burning zeal; and the lapse of a few centuries saw it prevail over a large portion of the Roman Empire. So Buddhism came from India to China, preached by enthusiastic missionaries, whom neither the dangers of the long unknown way, nor the difficulties of a language and people utterly different from theirs, could deter or appal. It was not by the wise and good of the Roman emperors, again, that early Christianity was favoured, but by profligates like Commodus and Heliogabalus;² and Chinese historians point to the dynasties which favoured Buddhism as those most marked by vice and weakness. Again, Christianity spread at first chiefly among the poor and ignorant—the "wool-workers, cobblers, leather-dressers, the most illiterate and vulgar of mankind";³ and it is still among the weak and foolish of this world that it finds its most ardent supporters. A similar remark applies also to the history of its eastern contemporary; although this, no less than the other, has never lacked the assistance of the strong and wise. The most strenuous opponents to the introduction of Christianity in the early ages were the philosophers and the conservatives in religion and politics—men who thought

² See Neander's History of the Christian Religion, &c., Vol. 1, p. 125 (American Translation). Compare also Buckle's History of Civilization in England, Vol. 1, pp. 168-9.

³ See Neander's History, &c., Vol. 1, p. 70.

that the "exitibilis superstition"⁴ could be easily extinguished—who could not understand or believe in the consuming zeal, the holy love, and the intrepid firmness in the hope of a glorious resurrection which animated the early converts. Every one knows how similar classes of men have been the inveterate enemies of Buddhism in China; and Han-yü and Chu-hsi are not unworthy to stand beside Arrian and Celsus. We will now see how the Chinese philosophers have from its introduction opposed this religion, and what arguments they advance against its toleration.

The investigation of this subject will show us that all who resisted the toleration and progress of Buddhism were not actuated by the same motives. Some opposed without having any settled conviction about the system, and without, indeed, knowing the grounds of their opposition. On the other hand there were many genuine Confucianists, who saw in the spread of Buddhism the ruin of their country, and with that the extinction of their master's doctrines. Others again studied to a certain extent the philosophy of the Buddhists, and waged an intellectual war against them on account of its alleged errors. Confucianists like Han-yü, Hu Chitt'ang, the brothers Ch'eng, and many others, who hated and opposed Buddhism on account of the evils which they thought its followers inflicted on the country, were all men of honest zeal. Some of them argued against it in works of great literary and philosophical merit. Thus Hu wrote his Tsung-chêng-pien 崇正編, he tells us, in order to refute the evil teachings of the Buddhists.⁵ This man hated Buddhism with a perfect hatred. He would not even acknowledge that its author and its early teachers were good men, and that their doctrines also were once good, and that these had in the lapse of time become degenerated. The yellow fountain cannot send forth black water, nor can the peach tree bear pine cones. Some wished to see

Buddhism forcibly expelled once and for ever—by burning its books, and driving out its professors. "Let him who would succeed the three holy men [of antiquity] burn me these books," is the exclamation of Chu-fu-tzü. One author thinks that to wish to have the country free from heretics is going to excess.⁶ The heavens do not always send seasonable rains and fair winds, and the earth does not always produce useful crops and harmless animals; so it cannot be but that worthless characters will exist in the world. Some thought that as Buddhism had existed for a long time in the country, and had spread itself far and wide, the evil could not be cured by violent means; and they accordingly counselled slow and gentle measures. Hu states his opinion on this subject very clearly.⁷ It was long since this religion had been introduced, and it could not now be abolished in a day. The proper course to pursue was to let the people know what harm it did, and not allow them to be confused by its teachings, and to abstain from giving any assistance to the professors of the religion. After thirty years of such treatment he believed that Buddhism would be entirely eradicated.

A few Confucianists seem to be almost inclined to toleration.⁸ According to their views the ultimate aim of this religion was identical with that of Confucianism—namely, the making of people good. Buddhism accordingly ought not to be treated disrespectfully, and utterly rejected. Some again thought that it had already brought ruin on the empire, and that nothing could save the country. Such a one was Han-yü. Mencius had been unable to oppose successfully Yang and Mè, the two arch heretics of his day. Now these two men were not nearly so bad as the Taoists and Buddhists, and Han-yü had not the abilities of Mencius. Still if he could have saved

⁴ Chu-hsi's 雜著, ch. 7.

⁵ T'ung-chien, &c., ch. 50.

⁶ Among these may be reckoned the Emperor Yung-cheng. See his Edicts, Fourth year, 7th moon, 3rd day.

⁴ The expression used by Tacitus, Annals, B. XV., ch. 44.

⁵ Ma Tuan-lin, ch. 227.

his country, even by his death, he would have done so⁹—

“Si Pergama dextra

Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent.” It may be a comfort to Han’s manes—if there be such—to know that to him has been ascribed the merit of preserving Confucianism from extinction.¹

The majority of the followers of Confucius can see in this religion nothing but what is loathsome. Its history, followers and dogmas are all equally hateful; and they can never be mentioned except to be, as it were, cursed. The compilers of the *Tung-chien-king-nu*, or *History of China*, are perhaps the most persistently bitter in their hostility. With these men any occasion of mentioning a subject related to Buddhism presents an opportunity for exposing and ridiculing the entire system. For men so illustrious as Pu-k’ung and Pa-sü-pa, they can use to express their death only the common term *ssü* 死.

The honorary term *tsu* 士 could not, they are careful to inform us, be applied to barbarian heretics. When Liang Wu-ti resigns the throne, and becomes a monk, the expression used in the text affords the annotator a considerable amount of amusement at the expense of the poor deluded emperor.²

We will now see how these philosophers and would-be philosophers opposed Buddhism; and, first, those who disliked it without knowing exactly for what reason. Many Confucianists speak and write disparagingly of this religion and its followers, simply because it is the fashion for their class to do so; and that they may thereby cheaply earn a philosophic name. We have seen already how Yung-chéng rebuked such men in his time, but there were always persons of this description. Knowing nothing whatever either about the doctrines which they professed to follow, or about those which they condemned, they talked of the excellency of the former and the wickedness of the latter in the same ignorant and flippant

manner. This class of men is very numerous at present, and it is only very rarely that one meets with a Confucianist who knows anything about the literature of Buddhism or the lives of its followers. And, indeed, while in words they abhor this religion, in act they are often its superstitious followers. Only because it is the fashion for the literati to depreciate everything that has not emanated from a Confucian origin, do these men clothe themselves in coarse garments, eat mean fare, and go about speaking ill of Buddhists and Taoists.³ The reason for the prevalence of such persons at the present time may be found, I think, in the degenerate state as well of Confucianism as of Buddhism. Both retain the empty forms of by-gone realities, and both have become in a greater or less degree time-servers.

Among the men of previous periods, and even among some of recent times, weightier objections have been set forth with earnestness of mind and vigour of language. On political, on moral, and on philosophical grounds, the professed followers of Confucius have opposed the introduction and toleration of Buddhism. The state and its miniature, the family, have long been to the Chinese the embodiment of all that is precious, and the completion of human life and duty. Hence any doctrine or course of conduct which seemed to cause injury to either or both of these has always been hateful in their eyes. Now one of the first political objections brought against Buddhism was that it was a barbarian system of doctrine.⁴ Its deified founder was called a man of the *Yi* and *Ti* 狄 獦; and his teachings were said to constitute the religion of these two races of savages—creatures ranked with birds and beasts, and beneath the dignity of man.⁵ Nothing could be more absurd, accordingly,

3 See Yung-chéng’s Edicts, 11th year, 3rd moon, 13th day.

4 Han Wen-kung, Fo Ku-phao, and his letter to Méan.

5 See Han Wen-kung’s Works, ch. 11, sect. 原

人. Slave-traders’ and others’ ideas about “niggers” correspond closely with those of the Chinese about these barbarians. Indeed Burnouf tells us that some Westerns even have called Buddha a negro.

9 See his letter to President Meng, Works, ch. 15.

1 See Chu-hsi’s 雜著, ch. 9

2 *Tung-chien*, &c., ch. 31.

than that the polished natives of the Flowery Land should adopt anything from such rude barbarians. Had not the great sage himself said, that were it not for Kwan-chung his countrymen might still have been as uncivilised as these tribes, who wore their hair loose, and buttoned their jackets to the left?⁶ Surely then the thought ought never to be entertained of borrowing from these same barbarians a system of belief and worship.

Another objection on political grounds which the Confucianists have brought forward against Buddhism is, that its monks and nuns eat the bread of idleness, and so impoverish the state; or, in the strong metaphor which they use, gnaw it like secretly-working insects.⁷ The subsistence of these religieux cost a large sum of money, which the people could very ill afford. They sat quietly in their well furnished houses, dressed in fine raiment and faring sumptuously, while outside men were ploughing and women were spinning to earn for themselves a difficult livelihood, and maintain the sacred idlers.

Besides, those who entered the religious life, whether as anchorites or as cenobites, withdrew themselves from the duties which they owed to the family and the state. The labours of the field and the service of government were with the maintenance of their relatives equally refused. The public revenue suffered in consequence, and the civil and military offices were insufficiently supplied.

Again, enormous amounts of metal, wood, and other materials were required for the construction of the images and sacred buildings.⁸ Many of the temples and monasteries were built on a magnificent scale, and adorned with costly ornaments; and these things were done at the expense of the poor deluded people. Moreover, the pious fancies of some of the Mongol rulers spent large sums of money in having

the sacred books transcribed in letters of gold. The money and materials thus foolishly used might have been employed to advantage in the construction and repair of public works, or might have helped to enrich the people.

But much more serious than the material injury which this heresy inflicts on the country is the moral detriment which it works. It teaches its followers to set at naught the three great relations of life—namely, those between father and son, prince and subject, husband and wife; and by doing so it saps the foundations of civil life.⁹ The son or daughter who professes religion parts forever from his or her parents, and ceases to have any regard for them; and there is the great authority of Mencius for saying that such persons are like birds and beasts. Buddhism also confuses the minds of the simple, by inventing a heaven as a reward for those who do well, and a hell as a punishment for those who do ill, according to Buddhist conceptions of good and evil. Now an undutiful child is the worst conceivable character, and yet heaven is offered even to such on the fulfilment of certain conditions. Unfilial sons become disloyal subjects, and thus a tendency to anarchy is produced. Sons cease to respect their natural parents, and transfer their affections and duty to strangers. So they transfer also the allegiance due to their sovereign to their chief in religion, and thus they become unfilial and disloyal. These remarks of course apply only to those who become monks or nuns.

Again the attachment of the rulers to Buddhism interfered seriously with the performance of the state ceremonies. The halls of learning and the old temples were allowed to go to ruin, when monasteries and pagodas were erected in great splendour. Thus the people were led to neglect the old ways taught by the venerable sages of antiquity, which had shed their brightness over the world, and to go astray in the new paths of outlandish error.

6 Lun-yü, B. XIV., ch. 18.

7 Tung-chien, &c., ch. 50, &c. For an eloquent protest against similar charges preferred against Christian monks, see Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, Introduction, pp. 100-125 (English translation.)

8 Tung-chien, &c., ch. 25, &c.

9 Ma Tuan-lin, ch. 227. Han Wen-kung's Works, ch. 11, the **原道**.

The religieux are also charged with leading immoral lives. They are said to look only for gain, and to have no scruples about the means of its attainment. Their doctrines about fasting, and the duty of giving alms, and repairing roads and bridges, are said to spring from merely selfish motives—to be invented for the purpose of filling their stomachs and clothing their bodies. They are also accused of collecting together in their temples and monasteries men and women of abandoned character, who under the cloak of religion invent sedition—people who meet together at night, and separate at day-break.¹ A very popular character in many plays and romances is the bonze who is enamoured of some man's wife, or allows an intrigue to be carried on within the precincts of his temple, or acts in some other highly improper manner. The chief interest, indeed, of not a few of these works attaches to a priest or monastery. Every one who has read the charming romance, *Shui-hu-chuan*, to take one example, will remember how important a part Buddhism plays in it. There is the Wu-t'ai monastery, which at the time of the scene of the romance was in its splendour, and contained 500 or 600 monks; although if this be the Buddhist establishment mentioned under the name Wu-t'ai in the T'ang dynasty, it must have suffered severely under Wu-tsung. The unwillingness of the brethren to shave the head of the redoubtable Lou-ta, who seemed to them very unlike a man fit to be a monk, the ease with which the abbot decides to admit him on learning that he is the cousin of the wealthy benefactor of the monastery, the levity of the monks, the irregularities of Lou-ta—now Brother Deep-knowledge—from his snoring like thunder, up to his kicking the wine-bearer down the hill, getting drunk on the wine and breaking the images, his final expulsion—all related with great spirit—form the principal attraction of the early part of this work. Then there are the wicked monks of the Precious Pearl Monastery; and all through the

book the religieux come before the reader in circumstances far from sacred or dignified.² The Confucianist, however, has always historical instances to quote, when he wishes to illustrate the wicked lives of those who abandon their natural parents and home in order to follow the precepts of Buddha. There have been many of these who have professed to possess the art of imparting immortality, of renewing youth, and of conferring on individuals whose sensual appetites have been cloyed a fresh zest for earthly delights.³ When magicians, fortune-tellers, and other such impostors are mentioned, Buddhist monks are often joined with them. Buddojinga is one of the most famous of the miracle workers, but many others have obtained a less enviable reputation. The miracles which this man wrought at the court of his prince were mostly of a useful nature, and not mere exhibitions of craft or power. He seems to have been a philosopher considerably in advance of his brethren and the rest of the world, and perhaps the story of his magic-working is no more true than the similar one about the Franciscan Brother Bacon.

The inconsistencies in the lives of professed followers of Buddha, again, formed a constant cause of reproach. Their founder was a man of peace and gentleness, who forbade the destruction of the life of another creature, and enjoined the mortification of one's own nature. Yet those who took his name were known to love war, to be patri-cides, and to practise unearthly arts for the preservation of this life, which their great Master had declared to be a simple source of woe. So also there are several instances of monks who had formally renounced the pomps and vanities of this world becoming fascinated with the charms of office and power.⁵

Again, the Confucianist asks about this religion, What good has it ever done, either to its followers or to the

2 A free translation of a portion of this book will be found in *Chine Moderne*, p. 516, &c.

3 *T'ung-chien*, chs. 40, 41, &c.

4 See Remusat's *Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques*, Vol. 2, p. 179.

5 *T'ung-chien*, chs. 25, 30, 42, &c.

1 See the Sacred Edict, sect. 7.

kingdom? Has the Buddha ever shown that he possesses supernatural powers which he is willing to exercise on man's behalf? There was king Wu, of the Liang dynasty—an enthusiastic disciple, if ever man was—and yet he was allowed to perish in hunger and ignominy. The Mongol emperors were ardent followers of Buddha, and yet their dynasty came to a shameful end, after a duration of little more than eighty years. His own pagodas and temples Buddha could not save from lightning—that is, he could not overcome Mara, or the devil.⁶ Further, in former ages emperors' reigns had extended over one hundred years; but since the introduction of the Indian religion they had dwindled down to a very small number.⁷ Now if Buddhism not only be impotent to do good, but also actually be the cause of injury, why should it be respected—seeing that one of the principal motives for doing so is the expectation of obtaining wealth and prosperity? Could it avail to benefit mankind, then, though 1,700,000 individuals were required to maintain 100,000 monks, yet the state ought not to grudge the expense,⁸ for Mencius has said that the good man **君子** ought to be supported.⁹ Since, however, Buddhism only does evil, destroying the very elements of civilisation, even though its followers lived on wind and dew, and roosted in nests, yet ought they to be exterminated.

We now come to consider the objections urged against the philosophical doctrines of Buddhism. Of these objections one of the most frequently brought forward is, that the tenets of the Buddhists in China are derived from Chwang-tzū and Lie-tzū.¹ It was not enough that these men should be found guilty of heresy, but they must also be indicted for having stolen their heresy. Chwang-tzū and Lie-tzū are two of the well known Ten Philosophers, and are professed followers of Lao-tzū. In their writings, especially in those of Lie-tzū, are many things

very similar to certain notions of the Buddhists. But when we remember that Lie-tzū's book is written in an ancient style, abounds in passages almost inexplicable, and presents other serious difficulties, we will be slow to believe that the Indians who came to China borrowed much from it, nor is there any proof of their Chinese successors having done so to any extent. Moreover those who make this assertion of plagiarism do not, except in a few instances, state the particular doctrines or passages in the writings of the Buddhists, which are stolen from the above named Chinese philosophers. Lie-tzū's country to the westward, where there is no fear or sorrow, resembles to a certain extent the Western Heaven of some Buddhists; but we know historically that the notion of the one is not borrowed from the other.

The literary merits of the sacred books are also spoken of slightly, and their style is pronounced to be low and vulgar. This is said especially of the Satra of Forty-two chapters, and the remark does not by any means apply to all. Even Confucian critics have allowed that several of these works are written in a style of great polish and elegance.

But if objections are made to the outward form of the books, much more are they made to the contents of the same. The doctrine of future rewards and punishments is condemned on philosophical no less than on moral grounds. It is better to teach men to do good and abstain from evil, simply because they ought to do so, than to hold out to them in an uncertain future the prospect of reward and punishment. He who is a really good man only does what is right and there stops; but persons imbued with superstitious notions, such as Buddhism teaches, look for a recompense for their conduct.² The law which regulates the world will inevitably, if there be a heaven and a hell, send those who live righteously to the one, and sinners to the other. Yet even this admission

6 T'ung-chien, &c., ch. 32.

7 Fo Ku-phao.

8 T'ung-chien, ch. 50.

9 Book III., Part 2, ch. 4.

1 See Chu-hsi's Chhian-shu, ch. 60.

2 See Chu-hsi 雜著, ch. 7. said by 折束.

would not be made by ultra Confucianists; for, as has been seen, they regard the soul as coming to an end simultaneously with the body. On this and other matters of dispute between Buddhists and Confucianists, we have a very interesting imaginary dialogue, to which I intend to make reference again.³

Buddhists further teach to slight the body, and regard it merely as a bleached bone.⁴ Nay, more, it is in their eyes vile and hateful, a pollution from which one should seek to be released. The world itself, they say, is all an illusion, and everything between birth and death is naught. Herein, says Chu-hsi, lies the source of the Buddhists' errors, and herein consists the great difference between them and the orthodox followers of Confucius.⁵ This sage taught that man's business on earth was to do his earthly duty, and take no thought for what might lie beyond the grave. Man's body is a thing of value, and to be preserved carefully; it is the gift of his parents and Heaven, and the clothing and food which it requires are all important matters. The modes of sitting, standing, lying, walking, were all with Confucius worthy of serious consideration. In the philosophy of Buddhism, on the other hand, all things relating to the body merely are treated as unworthy of serious notice; and strict rules about them have been established in monasteries and other places as a means to the attainment of perfection in a future existence. It also teaches that the spirit can leave the body at pleasure, and that one can exist for a time without hearing or seeing. This mode of living one sect at least of Buddhism encourages, and hence, in part, comes the hatred of the body. To the state of undisturbed contemplation which these individuals wish to reach, the organs and affections of the body present great obstacles. They accordingly lacerate and otherwise ill

treat themselves, in order to subdue their bodies.

The existence of many worlds and the transmigration of souls are also dogmas of Buddhist philosophy,⁶ and wholly without foundation. Beyond this visible universe there are countless others all subject to the Buddha. The life of man

"Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar"—

nor is death his end-all. There are various stages of untried being through which he must pass before his fate can be ultimately settled. From this doctrine arise the ceremonies for the souls of the dead, against which, as has been seen, the Confucianists have protested vigorously.

Again, Buddhist philosophy is said to teach selfishness. Every man according to it need take care only for himself. Thus, say the Confucianists, it ignores the feelings of compassion, and love, and friendship; and, as these are essential constituents of human nature,⁷ Buddhism degrades man to the level of the brutes.

This heretical system is also inconsistent, and even self-contradictory. It teaches that man ought not to take the lives of the animals which surround him, and that he should not so much as hurt them; but this tenderness and this compassion are not extended to the vegetable world. Why should not flowers and plants be spared, as well as birds and beasts? The altars of Buddha are not, it is true, stained with blood; but the flowers of the field are plucked to adorn them.⁸ Again, why should man's sexual desires alone be utterly suppressed, by the complete interdiction of marriage after taking the vows of religion? Why also do the religieux cut off only their hair, and not a hand or a foot also? Further, if the body and all this visible world be indeed so utterly worthless as they are represented, it is surely absurd to pay respect to images and reliques. The in-

³ In the Sung-shu, *列傳*, ch. 57; also Edkins, in *N. C. H.*, No. 201.

⁴ Chu-hsi, *全書*, ch. 60.

⁵ See also his *小學*, &c., ch. 1, Introduction.

⁶ Ma Tuan-lin, ch. 227.

⁷ See Mencius, Book II., Part 1, ch. 6.

⁸ Ma Tuan-lin, ch. 227.

dignant manner in which Han Wén-kung speaks of the supposed finger-bone of Buddha is worthy of being imitated by all foes to relic worship. Buddha, he says, has been dead a long time—his bones are all rotten—and here was the Son of Heaven bringing this stinking bone of a dead barbarian into the interior of his palace! There was not even the preliminary ceremony of exorcising the noxious demons by whisking them out with branches of the peach and *lie* trees.⁹ Another Confucianist asks, What can a bone, or a tooth, or a nail, do for living men? If you are hungry, these things cannot feed you, if cold they cannot clothe you, and if sick they cannot cure you.¹ Not less foolish and inconsistent do Confucianists profess to regard Buddhism when teaching the duty and merit of paying worship to images.

Such are some of the views which the highly favoured disciples of Confucius have been wont to express about this system of religion and philosophy. They appear, as it were, arraigning Buddhism before the tribunal of the nation, and a strong case they make out against it—not, however, without the use of means somewhat discreditable. As we proceed we will find that the Buddhists have much to say on the other side, and that they speak with much less spite and bitterness.

In giving some account of Buddhism in China the best course is, perhaps, to adopt the threefold division indicated by the San Pao, or Three Precious Things, of its followers. I propose, accordingly, to treat briefly of its deities, literature, and professed adherents—corresponding somewhat to Buddha, the Law, and the Priesthood.

(To be continued.)

⁹ Fo Ku-piao.

¹ T'ung-chien, &c., ch. 32. The words are Hu Chi-t'ang's.

ON THE BEST METHOD OF PRESENTING THE GOSPEL TO THE CHINESE.

BY REV. F. S. TURNER.

CHAPTER IV. *A Review.*

In my last paper I said that I thought a partial answer had been found to our inquiry. Let us review what has been accomplished, or at least attempted.

On his arrival in China, the missionary, filled with pity at the sight of the heathen, and longing to tell them the truth of God, and the way of life, is absolutely debarred by his ignorance of their language. Months and years pass by; the unaccustomed sounds and idioms become familiar; at last the joyful day arrives when he takes his stand in the midst of a group of curiously listening natives, and proclaims to them in their own tongue "the wonderful works of God." Eagerly, in impassioned strains, he discourses of the incarnation of Deity, and the crucified Mediator, of repentance and faith, atonement and regeneration, and all the wondrous mysteries of redeeming love. But, alas! his burning words fall upon senseless ears. He is baffled now by a new obstacle, not less formidable than that which has just been surmounted. The heathen do not understand what he is saying. The words are Chinese; the pronunciation is correct; the phraseology is idiomatic; yet they hear as though he were speaking a foreign language. And to them a foreign language it is. The ideas, and reasonings, the very terms are unintelligible, or bear no full vivid meaning to their hearts. Is this surprising? Far as the missionary has travelled, though this has been over half the globe, to proclaim the glad tidings among this people; spiritually, he and they are separated by a wider distance still. He, dwelling in the light of truth, rejoicing in God, trusting in the Saviour, renouncing self, and loathing sin; what has he in common with these poor benighted ones, without God, without hope, living in sin, whose highest felicity is the indulgence of their sensual appetites, or the accumulation of wealth, whose consciences are deadened by repeated opposition, and whose religious instincts are dulled, rather than satisfied, by repeating unintelligible liturgies to images of clay? What wonder is it that they do not understand his words, and go away muttering, "he seems to be a setter forth of strange gods?" But their failing to understand the missionary is partly the consequence of his

not understanding them. He does not yet know the depth of their ignorance, and preaches in polysyllables, and long propositions, before they have learnt the very alphabet of spiritual language. This state of things must sooner or later arrest the missionary's attention; and every one will try in the best way he can to bridge over this gulf between him and his hearers, and to get close to their minds and hearts with his message of salvation.

Now what we have been engaged upon hitherto has been an attempt to discover the natural and right method of this preliminary instruction. Taking Paul for our guide, we deduced some lessons from his discourse at Athens. These lessons were fortified by a contemplation of the actually existing state of humanity in relation to religious truth. We learnt that the missionary must adapt his tone and temper to the facts of the case, and the state of his hearers. He should lay aside a too imperious dogmatism, and speak in the gentle tones of a father instructing little children. He must not denounce stolid ignorance as rebellion; nor incapacity for belief as wilful rejection of the truth. He must cultivate a Pauline breadth of view and largeness of heart, to appreciate every right feeling and noble aspiration which may be found in the midst of heathen degeneracy. Secondly, we have learnt, that to prepare the heathen for the gospel, we must proceed along the track of those moral and religious ideas which pre-exist in their minds, or are most easily introduced there. Consciences which are asleep must be aroused. The instincts of their nature crying out for the Heavenly Father must be appealed to. Whatever testimony to truth and right "prophets of their own" have borne must be welcomed as a valuable auxiliary to our arguments. In this way, we may hope some stirring of spiritual life will be felt in their breasts, and they will be led to listen attentively, if not to ask with some earnestness, "Have you indeed a gospel—a good message from God to me? Let me hear it; and tell me what claims it has on my acceptance."

We must not expect too much from this preliminary teaching. Preaching morality and theism will hardly suffice to bring the heathen on his knees crying out, "God be merciful to me a sinner!" This climax it remains for the gospel itself to accomplish. Nevertheless the earlier elementary instruction is lost nor needless, because it does not of itself vitalise the spirit. The ancients fabled that Pygmalion carved a beautiful life-like form out of cold marble; and in answer to his prayers, a divine breath warmed the stone into living flesh and blood. So we

work upon hard, stony hearts, and bring them into some cold logical apprehension of truth, prepared for the quickening power of the gospel. Nor need we try to draw any distinct line of demarcation; saying, thus far I will teach elementary truth, and not until its lessons are fully mastered will I proceed to the gospel itself. Rather should the two overlap, and run into, each other; so that the message of divine grace may be ever near, to take advantage of the first stirring of the conscience, the faintest yearning of the spirit after God.

With these remarks I must leave the first part of the inquiry, fearing that I have exhausted the patience of my readers, rather than the subject itself. I do so, with the assurance that what I have written, I have written in the spirit of an inquirer after truth, rather than as a teacher of others; and that if any one will point out error and supplement defect in this brief essay, according as clearer insight may be given to him from above, his criticism will be more welcome to no one than to myself.

HONGKONG, July, 1869.

(*To be continued.*)

THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO POLYGAMY.

BY REV. J. V. N. TALMAGE, D. D.

When an individual having a plurality of wives, as is very common in China, becomes interested in the gospel, and asks for admission into the Christian church, do the doctrines of Christianity require that he should put away all his wives except one before he can be received to the ordinance of Christian baptism? On this question, several articles have appeared in the RECORDER. The article prepared by Rev. R. Nelson, and published in the number for January last, because of its fulness, is the most important one that has appeared advocating the affirmative. The most important paper that has appeared in answer is the article prepared by Rev. Samuel Dodd, and published in the July number. The subject being one of such great practical importance in the evangelization of China, perhaps room will be granted for some further discussion; especially if it be conducted in a spirit so temperate as that manifested by Brothers Nelson and Dodd. I know not that I shall be able to throw much additional light on the subject, but I shall, at least, be able to give my testimony in behalf of what seems to me to be important truth.

I agree heartily, in the main, with the views expressed by Mr. Nelson. He will allow me,

however, to take exception to the *language* of one of his statements. He says there is "but one authority on the subject—the New Testament Scriptures." Instead of the phrase "the New Testament Scriptures," I should prefer the phrase "the Holy Scriptures" or "the Bible." Our Lord and his apostles always quote the Old Testament as *authority* for the Christian church. It is concerning the Old Testament that it is said, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Hence the doctrine of Protestantism, that the Word of God, comprised both of the Old and New Testaments, is *the rule of faith*. Of course we are to interpret the Old Testament by the statements of the New. So also we often learn the meaning of the New Testament by the statements of the Old. Both are equally the Word of God. I trust, however, that the views of Mr. Nelson on this subject do not differ from mine.

We are indebted to the excellent paper of Mr. Dodd for simplifying the discussion. He agrees heartily to two of the three general principles laid down by Mr. Nelson. His only objection to the third is that it seems to him to demand a standard of perfection too high to be attained to in this imperfect world, or at least in this age and country. In answer to this, I have heard it suggested as a characteristic of the Saviour's teaching, that he did not in any instance lower the standard of duty to suit the defects of that age and country. If polygamy, and divorce for insufficient cause, were confessedly common, he does not teach that allowance should be made for this, and the Christian church be organized to suit these defects. He merely refers to and asserts the original and unalterable law on the subject. He did not teach a *gradual* putting away of sin in the church, more than in the individual; on the contrary, he always taught the law of God in its perfection. Notwithstanding this, evils did grow up in abundance in the church. They would have grown up much more abundantly, if he and his apostles had lowered the standard. So, I conceive, we should follow the example of the Saviour in this respect in organizing his church in China. Violation of positive law should in no case be allowed. There will still be room enough for the full exercise of Christian charity, in the multitude of cases which are left to each individual's conscience.

Both parties—those who hold to the affirmative, and those who hold to the negative, of the question with which this article begins—admit that Christianity is opposed to polygamy. We, the advocates of the affirmative, believe, as Mr. Nelson has expressed it (and fully proved from the language of the Saviour), that "polygamy involves adultery," and is therefore a sin, which the Christian church, with the light of the New Testament, must forbid to its members. The advocates of the negative, if I understand them, admit that this is true in a Christian land, but not so in China. The language of Mr. Dodd is, "While there-

fore granting unhesitatingly Mr. Nelson's assertion that polygamy involves adultery, as far as he or we are concerned, we differ with him *in toto* when he applies the same rule to the Chinese." Will our good brother allow me to ask him, What law is it that makes polygamy, at least in some countries, adultery? Is it the law of God? or is it the law of men? If the law of God make it so, can the law of men unmake it? Is the Christian church to be regulated by the laws of men, or by the laws of God as modified by the laws of men, or simply by the laws of God?

Our doctrine is that the law of God as given at the institution of marriage in the beginning, and as expounded by our Saviour, and as implied in all the teachings of the apostles, makes polygamy adultery, and therefore polygamy must not be admitted into the Christian church. It seems hardly necessary again to argue these points. God instituted marriage. He did not institute polygamy. The very language of the institution as recorded in Genesis, and as quoted and commented on by the Saviour, makes marriage the union of *one* man and *one* woman for life. The phrase "*they train shall be one flesh*" does as surely confine marriage to two parties, *one* man and *one* woman, as it makes marriage a union for life. The reason why the Saviour only applies it to divorce is because the subject of divorce, and not polygamy, was referred to him. But his language, in disposing of divorce, proves polygamy to be adultery.

If the argument of Mr. Lobscheid in answer to this, in the March number of the RECORDER, be sound, then we have no authority to forbid even those who are already Christians taking to themselves a plurality of wives. He tells us that *he himself believes* "monogamy to be the only form of wedlock conducive to family happiness and morality;" but that "polygamy has been ratified by God." Polygamy was not only tolerated, but openly acknowledged by God, and laws were given to regulate the same"—i. e., to use his own comment, *laws were given for its practice*. This, if correct, is making a strong case for the polygamist—on the one side *divine law and sanction*, on the other *merely the belief of an uninspired man!* This needs no other answer than its simple statement.

The teaching of the Saviour being so explicit against polygamy, we, as we should expect, do not find the first trace of polygamy in the Christian church organized by him and his apostles. Marriage is always spoken of as being a union between only two persons, one man and one woman. There is not even a single passage in all the Epistles dissuading from polygamy, and—with the possible exception of the one phrase, "husband of one wife," occurring in 1 Tim. 3: 2, and repeated in verse 12th, and again in Tit. 1: 6, to be noticed presently—not a single allusion to it. Now, if the idea of our opponents in this discussion be correct, that there was so much polygamy among the Jews and Greeks at the

time of the establishment of the Christian church, and that therefore polygamists were received into the church, how shall we account for all this silence? Shall we infer from it the doctrine implied in "the summing up of the case" by "intelligent and excellent Chinese Christians," as given by Mr. Turner—"the Old Testament permits polygamy; the New Testament does not mention it"—and plainly taught, as we have already seen, by Mr. Lobscheid, that polygamy is not a sinful practice, being sanctioned and approved of by God, and only opposed by men, and therefore of course originally permitted in the Christian church? Or shall we rather infer that the New Testament church was organized according to the doctrine of the Saviour, and polygamy never allowed to enter it? We prefer the latter alternative. This will account also for the historical fact implied in the language of Dean Alford, "no instance being adduced of polygamy being practiced in the Christian church." If polygamy was allowed in the Christian church as a necessary evil, and that only while the church was in a "transition state," it does seem unaccountable that there should not be a single allusion to fact in the whole New Testament, and not a single exhortation to guard against the evil becoming permanent.

Now a few words in reference to the phrase, "the husband of one wife" (1 Tim. 3: 2). Mr. Dodd remarks, "The manner in which Mr. Nelson gets round" this text "is not by any means universally accepted as the interpretation." The same remark might be made as regards the way in which Mr. Dodd "gets round" the passage. His interpretation also is by no means universally accepted. See Bengel, Olshausen, Alford, Ellicott, and the most of recent critics and interpreters. A phrase which confessedly admits of such a variety of interpretation surely cannot be relied on to prove that polygamy was permitted in the Christian church; and whatever interpretation you give it, it either plainly teaches, or it implies that polygamy is wrong.

Mr. Dodd says, "The whole discussion hinges on the one and only point of 'putting away'." "Let Mr. N., or any other, bring forward one text to show that the applicant for baptism in the apostolic church was required to put away all his wives except one, and the debate ceases between him and us from that moment." We certainly demur to this statement of the way of settling the controversy. The fundamental law of marriage forbids polygamy. The Saviour reasserted most distinctly that fundamental law. We are bound to believe that his disciples conformed to his law, unless we have proof to the contrary. Our opponents must give us some proof that polygamists were received into the church; else they must allow us to believe that the church was organized according to the plain doctrines of the Master. For the same reason, when the Saviour has plainly taught us a doc-

trine, we must teach the same to our Christian converts, and organize our churches in accordance therewith. If any tell us that there are exceptions to this rule, it is their duty to point out the exception. The burden of proof lies on them.

If we had nothing but the teachings of Christ and his apostles on this subject, there would have been no ground for difference of opinion. Their doctrines are plain. They so taught notwithstanding the statements of the Old Testament, which they understood much better than we do. If we think the Old Testament teaches a different doctrine, it must be that we mistake its meaning. Here then the discussion might rest. But perhaps we should point out some of the obvious mistakes concerning the teachings of the Old Testament made by our opponents.

Mr. Dodd says, "Now let it be borne in mind that we hold polygamy to be a lower and less desirable type of civilization (if he had used the word "barbarism" instead of "civilization," he would have expressed our idea better); yet we find that our Heavenly Father, who knows how to adapt his instructions to the capacities of his learners, did sanction and regulate the practice of polygamy among his ancient people. See Deut. 21: 15. And so we find again, that when Nathan the prophet would reprove king David for his adultery with Bathsheba, God speaking by the prophet says, 'I gave thee thy Master's *wives* into thy bosom.' Now if Mr. N.'s position that 'polygamy involves adultery' be tenable, David was living in adultery all the time, not only before his sin with Bathsheba, but before receiving the wives of his predecessor; and yet the Lord conferred that favor of a plurality of wives upon him that only caused him to increase his adultery." Now we take issue on all such statements as that God approves of or sanctions, or ever did approve of or sanction, polygamy. We find no such doctrine even in the Old Testament. The most that can be said is that God tolerated it.

As we have already seen, the language of the institution of marriage, standing at the head of the Old Testament, does most certainly forbid polygamy. The first notice of polygamy in the Old Testament stamps it with the divine displeasure. It had its origin in the godless race of Cain, whose history begins with murder, and ends with polygamy and murder. There is no allusion at all to polygamy in the race of Seth, the worshippers of God, before the flood, except it be in the language of Gen. 6: 2. That language does seem to include polygamy. If so, then it is another passage in which God has most distinctly pronounced against polygamy.

Among the laws of Moses, there is not one that sanctions polygamy. The only one appealed to is Deut. 21: 15. This text, it is said, regulates polygamy, and therefore sanctions it. Suppose we allow the premise, does the conclusion follow? Is regulating necessarily

sanctioning? When Moses found an evil existing among the people, which on account of "the hardness of their hearts" it was impracticable immediately to eradicate, and therefore by divine sanction made regulations to restrain as far as possible the evil, is this *sanctioning the evil?* Please look at the two verses immediately preceding the one quoted. Because a man is forbidden, when he sends away a female slave, whom he had taken as a concubine, *to sell her*, are we to infer the divine sanction for such departures from the original institution, both in marrying and divorcing, and therefore allow such things in our Chinese churches? or shall we find in the regulation an effort to decrease existing evil? We prefer the latter alternative. But we deny also the premise in this argument. The law referred to does not regulate polygamy at all. It finds polygamy existing, and makes no regulations whatever concerning it, how or in what manner it may or may not be practiced. It is a law regulating the rights of the children, not of the father. Polygamy must not vitiate the right of the "first born." Let us suppose a case. The British or American Government, finding that its young men in China too often are guilty of living in a state of concubinage with Chinese women, and finding no way to put an end to this wickedness, it publishes an "Order in Council," or enacts a law, that any subject or citizen having a child by such connection shall be bound to provide for the proper maintenance of such child. The law would be eminently just, but would it thereby sanction such concubinage?

After the deluge, we find the practice of polygamy painfully prevalent among the people of God for many ages. We also find that the sacred historians have uniformly recorded great evils, as connected with and springing from it—so great as clearly to stamp the practice with the divine displeasure. See the histories of the families of Abraham, of Jacob, Gideon, Gilead, Elkanah, David and Solomon. True, in these records there is no distinct statement of the divine displeasure. Shall we therefore infer the divine approbation? If all the facts which are recorded in the Word of God, simply as facts, without comment approving of or condemning them, receive thereby the divine sanction, I know not what sin has not in some age of the world met with the divine sanction. One instance, for illustration, will be sufficient. Will any one say that the deception and lying which Jacob and his mother practised, in order to secure the blessing of Isaac, were approved of, because they are recorded in the Word of God without comment? Jacob said unto his father, "I am Esau, thy first born; I have done according as thou badest me. Arise I pray thee, sit and eat of my venison, that thy soul may bless me." Isaac said unto his son, "How is it that thou hast found it so quickly, my son?" And he said "Because the Lord thy God brought it to me" (Gen. 27: 19, 20.) *Deception and lying!* it is *awful blasphemy*. I trust it is not

necessary to stop and prove that Jacob's conduct incurred the divine displeasure.

I have selected this instance, because it will illustrate another of the ideas used with so much confidence in this discussion. We are told that "polygamy has been ratified by God, by confirming the blessing of all Jacob's children, whether they were from the first or second wives, or from the maid servants." I should say that polygamy was condemned by God, by the terrible evils which arose therefrom in Jacob's family, embittering the greater part of his life. But if Mr. Lobscheid's view be correct, then we must decide that Jacob's fraud and blasphemy met with the divine approval, because it was through them that he obtained his father's blessing, and this blessing was afterwards ratified by God himself. Such conclusion, it seems to me, would be blasphemy almost equal to that of Jacob's. A God who can approve of such, or any sin, is not the God of the Bible. God in his sovereignty does bestow his blessings on the unworthy, and he may sometimes even use the wickedness of men, and wicked men themselves, as occasions and channels through which to bestow his blessings. He does not thereby approve of their unworthiness, or sanctify their wickedness. In his sovereign goodness, he bestows his blessings in spite of these things. It was not necessary in order to secure the blessing of "the promised seed" that Abraham "go in unto Hagar," or that Jacob deceive his father and afterwards become guilty of polygamy, or that Judah commit adultery and incest with his daughter-in-law, or that David commit adultery and murder. Yet it was through these things that God fulfilled his promise, and sent his Son into the world. All these things were sins which God might forgive, but could never sanction, so long as he remains God.

The passage, of all others, relied on to prove that God sanctioned polygamy is in the address of the prophet Nathan to David (II Sam. 12: 8.) The Lord said, "I gave thee *** thy master's wives into thy bosom." We are reminded that the word used is "given, not merely allowed," that "the Lord conferred that favor of a plurality of wives upon him." Will our good friends please read the address of Nathan a little further? In the 11th verse, the Lord says, "I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbor," &c. To find the fulfilment of this language, see chaps. 15: 16, and 16: 21, 22. Will any one tell us that God sanctioned and approved of Absalom's vile conduct in this matter, because the word *give* is used?

The conclusion at which we arrive is that polygamy is contrary to the law of God; though tolerated for a while, it was never sanctioned; and even that toleration has been taken away—therefore it must not be allowed in the Christian church, either in China or any other land.

I should like to have added something on several other points, especially on the prac-

tical question of the hardships involved in carrying out the divine law in its strictness. These have been practical questions in our missionary experience, and these doubtless have been the chief cause of so much difference of opinion on the subject among missionaries. But space at present forbids.

AMOY, July 9th, 1869.

THE SMALL FEET OF CHINESE WOMEN.

BY J. DUDGEON. M. D.

My attention has been called to this subject by a case of a remarkable bony-fibrous tumour of the small foot, the result of a fall seven years before, and which is fully detailed in the Hospital Report for 1868.

Those who have looked into this matter, even in the most cursory way, must have been struck with the uncertainty of the time at and the manner in which the practice first obtained. The reasons assigned for it, also, are equally various. Some ascribe the honour of having set the fashion to Li-yao-niang, the favorite concubine of Li-heu-chu, the last prince of the Heu T'ang dynasty (A. D. 931.) She had the repute of being slender, beautiful, and an accomplished dancer. The Emperor caused golden lilies to be made, adorned with all manner of precious stones, and covered with images of snowy clouds; and upon these the favorite danced, with her feet compressed by bandages into the shape of the new moon.

Mention is made in Chinese books of small feet in the time of Ch'en-heu-chu, the last prince of the Chen dynasty (A. D. 583.) But their statements are not quite to be relied upon. The similarity of the story may be traced to the likeness in the names and characters of the two Emperors, both being also the last princes of dynasties.

Others ascribe a similar story to Yang-ti of the Sui dynasty (A. D. 505-613.) The practice is not referred to in the classics, which is presumptive evidence that it did not exist so early as the time of Confucius. We know from reliable authority that the Empress of Hieun-tsung (A. D. 713) had large feet; it is therefore highly probable that the practice does not date further back than the 10th century. From the concubine P'an-fei of Chen-heu-chu, is said to be derived "golden lilies," a term applied to small feet. Tradition reports that this poetical term originated in this way; her lord caused the palace floor to be adorned with lilies, figured in gold, and exclaimed as his favorite walked upon them, "Every step produces a lily." This may be the date of the origin of the practice, or at least of the poetical term, although it may have been 500 years later before small feet became general.

Among the sundry reasons assigned for the origin of this custom, some relate that one of the princesses or concubines in the Shang dynasty (B. C. 1766-1122), of extraordinary beauty and virtue, had feet like a bird, and therefore kept them always carefully wrapped up and concealed, even from the Emperor, her husband. The court ladies followed her example, and thus it soon became universal. The literati place little faith in this story. Others inform us that it arose from copying the pattern of a club-footed Empress; or, in other words, because of her own club-feet, she caused all the court ladies to adopt small feet, to appear like hers—a condition of parts resembling what we term *talipes calcaneus*. It is alleged by others that small and delicate feet being fashionable and much admired, even one sought to be in the fashion, and thus what could not be had by nature was gained by art. Perfect beauty is thought to lie in extreme delicacy. By others, the concubine of the T'ang prince is said to have begun it, by first binding her own feet; and the people imitated her example. This account is not inconsistent with the usual course of the capricious dame, Fashion. On the other hand, it is said that having some deformity in her feet, she had recourse to compression to remedy the natural defect, and gallantry suggested that all women should imitate her. In regard to this last course, an old writer points the moral, that princes ought to avoid making themselves the authors of ridiculous novelties. Of this personage with the ill-shapen feet, it is said she was so lowly and virtuous, that the court matrons naturally and voluntarily bound their feet to appear like her.

Li-yao-niang's whole conduct has received quite another construction by some Chinese, and considerable weight has been attached to it. It is attributed to her that she adopted this mode to gain increase, and to excite the affection of her imperial lord; and it is said to be on this account, even at the present day, that the small foot is always robed and concealed in pictures, that it is banished from the conversation of polite and learned society, that it is rude and immoral to gaze upon it, or seek to examine it, and that having done so, it is made a matter of the confessional in Roman Catholic churches. As it originated, in a desire, and is probably partly maintained or at least found, to create and excite lustful and licentious feelings, by the display of a small foot, a small and highly embroidered shoe, and flowery and gaudy under-dresses, so the subject on this account is shunned in society. It is evidently inconvenient for all the purposes for which the foot was intended; and to the Chinese—who, not to speak of their highly practical turn and character, abhor amputations, decapitation, cutting into a thousand pieces, and even tooth extraction, because of its filial impiety—its existence must indeed seem strange and inconsistent. Their bodies, received from their parents, should be kept complete and un mutilated; how other-

wise, too, could they appear respectable in the next world? Moreover, Confucius did not know of its existence, or at least never inculcated it, and this too should be a good reason for its discontinuance! This view of the subject is here lightly touched upon (further digression and amplification would be out of place in a journal of this kind), as some prominence has been given to it by one or two modern French writers, who, for the reasons above stated, have ascribed some unusual development of certain organs as the cause and effect of the practice; and this is founded on the law of equilibrium, which it is said the Chinese fully understand when applied to the vegetable world. I do not believe that any such result follows from compression of the foot. It is difficult to see what osseous, vascular, muscular or nervous connexion there is to account for this supposed condition of parts.

There are not wanting those who ascribe it to jealousy—a device of the husbands to keep their wives at home, prevent too much gadding about, to curb their power, and place them under subjection to their lawful lords. One of their ancient Emperors is said to have planned this, and to have purposely given the preference to small feet. But this crippling of the instruments of locomotion, and attempt to render walking a burden, has not deprived them of the power of walking, or of longing to see the world. It is also said to have sprung up from the desire of an Empress to please her royal master; and having succeeded in this, the other ladies of the court vied with her by following her example, and so divided the imperial attentions. The peculiar, graceful, easy, and waving-to-and-fro motions of the stage in dancing and playing were much admired and coveted by the ladies, and the desire for the obtainment of this excellence resulted in bandaged feet. Such are a few of the many reasons given by different persons for the origin of this practice.

Different nations vary in their ideas of beauty. All have more or less adopted some standard, and practised it; no matter how far that standard may be removed from the natural one. The Chinese think *small feet* beauty, *par excellence*. To us these little feet, "which lie in their gilded haunts like some criminals, who for parricide or other heinous offences are buried alive," and which give to the body that hobbling, unsteady, always inclined gait, are anything but charming. The club appearance, the unnatural instep, the uncouth ankle (!), or the shrivelled, lifeless skin, and the apparently ankylozed joints, are to us positively repulsive and disagreeable. The Chinese are not alone in having departed from the standard of nature, and having sought beauty and distinction even in deformity. The Caribs, Mexicans, and at an early date the peoples of Eastern Europe (and the Poles of the present day), flattened the foreheads of their children by applying boards, bandages, or other suitable contrivances, because they thought those the most noble who had the

longest heads; as Hippocrates, the Father of Physic, says regarding the *Marcrocephali*, a Scythian race, who probably inhabited the Crimea; and cranial remains, recently brought to light at Kertch, would go to prove the truth of the practice. The Malays file off the enamel of their teeth, and dye them black, for the all sufficient reason, according to Davis, that dogs' teeth are white. The Greek and Turk are believed to have in part produced their rounded heads by the effect of the national cap and turban. (The continued compression however for centuries has had no perceptible influence on the structure and size of the Chinese female foot, which, if allowed to grow, becomes perfectly natural in size and figure.) The Polynesian chiefs have had their distinctive coat of arms emblazoned on their skin; and the Esquimaux are said to have bits of stone stuffed through a hole in each cheek.

In Europe even, at the present day, fashion has compelled too many to cripple a region much more essential to life than the feet. The tightly compressed wasp-like waist is quite as absurd and much more mischievous than the cramping of the foot, which after all is more inconvenient than dangerous. I have never seen a strong, robust, small-footed woman; but neither have I seen any diseases of the small foot, or other parts, traceable directly to this cause; and the tumour case, mentioned in the Report, might have happened to a large-footed person. In the South, a few cases of caries, necrosis or softening of bone, sprains, bruises, and fractures, simple and compound, have been noted; and in a few instances gangrene, where the feet dropped off at the ankle-joint. Many of the diseases peculiar to woman are however, more amenable to treatment in the large-footed class; for as a rule they are without those restrictive, seclusive and sedentary rules prescribed by society for the small-footed class. The former, except where the Tartar element prevails, as in the capital and the garrisons of the large cities, are of a low grade in society. One reason, however, why diseases of the small foot are seldom if ever seen, may probably be owing to the natural reluctance to exhibit their feet. By no means can a sight of them be had for examination. There is a sort of masonic secrecy about them; the maid turns away her gaze, it is said by some, while her mistress is engaged with her golden lilies. The repulsion is sometimes so great, that it is said that the husband even is not permitted to see the bare feet of his wife. But the experience of this and other hospitals in China proves that diseases of the small foot are rarely, if ever, seen; and at the same time the dispensaries are often thronged with this class, who frequently come long distances on foot. In most cases, the better class come in chairs

or cart, and are supported while walking by leaning on the shoulder of a maid servant.

Such diseases as chlorosis, dysmenorrhœa, amenorrhœa, leucorrhœa, &c., are found more frequent and intractable among the small-footed class, and these affections seriously affect population. As a rule, Chinese families are smaller than European; the number of unfruitful marriages is enormously great—partly owing to the causes above stated, but doubtless also in part to the extensive use and deleterious effects of opium smoking, and to the practice of suckling their children for three, four, or five years, which is so common here. At the same time in no country is the desire for posterity greater, especially for male children.

The Tartar women do not wear small feet, but shoes with a large square piece of wood in the middle of the sole. These likewise appear very inconvenient; but in wet weather or muddy streets, they raise the finely embroidered satin slipper above danger. In Peking, the Tartar element is so strong, that small feet are less frequently seen than in the South. The small foot, too, is much larger here. A milder form of compression, especially among the country people, exists; the four toes being bound under the foot, without changing the direction of the heel very much. Ladies in the South desire a three inch foot; here they are content with a seven inch. The Chinese have naturally very small hands and feet. The proximity of the large-footed Mongols and Mantchus, and the influence of the court, we have said, exert their influence here, and render possible the marriage of large-footed daughters to Mantchu husbands. It is illegal for the bannermen and Chinese to intermarry; nevertheless about 20 per cent. of the former marry large-footed Chinese; but the marriage of Mantchu daughters to Chinese husbands—a union not considered respectable and complimentary from a Mantchu stand-point—is rare, not more probably than about one per cent. The Emperor's wives and concubines must belong to the large-footed class; in other words, must be Mantchus. Women of no class beyond the above are permitted to enter the palace; and some one has said, with what degree of truth I know not, that a small-footed woman entering the palace would be put to death immediately. One of Tau-kuang's concubines, Tung-fei, out of sport, one day dressed herself in the habiliments of the small-footed class, and appeared before the Emperor. She was instantly ordered from his presence, and he refused ever to see her again. She remained in strict seclusion in the palace. It is a rule of this dynasty never to expel those who have been

once admitted to the seraglio. Once in the Forbidden City, always there. The Chinese generally choose, or rather have chosen for them by their mothers or go-betweens, a small-footed woman for their first or principal wife; and they themselves add to this, by purchase or otherwise, a large-footed concubine; and *vice versa*, a Mantchu with a large-footed wife, if of sufficient means to maintain more, adds the desired number of small-footed secondary wives to his stock.

Poverty and necessity sometimes lay an interdict on this essential of all female beauty. Were it not so, all would be in the fashion. The richer the families, the earlier in life is the compression commenced. Like the long nails, small feet convey the idea of gentility and exemption from labour. The strength of this fashion may be judged of from the very poorest striving to conform to it. Fashion leads mothers not to neglect this part of the education of their daughters, however careless in other matters. Few girls are taught to read; almost all have their feet bound. Fashion must always prevail over convenience. Women ought never to appear in public; in state affairs they neither assist by their counsel, nor disturb by their ambition; and thus, to make this maxim more observed, they are taught that small feet constitute beauty, and the mother's first care therefore is to make her daughter fashionable by making her a cripple.

It has been said by some one, that before the marriage engagements take place, the parties not being permitted to see each other, the exact size of the lady's foot is given, after the manner of sending photographs sometimes practised in Europe. And again, that the small shoe is exhibited to the parents of the bridegroom, as one of the arguments employed in discussing the amount of purchase money, or money to be given in presents, to the bride and her family; which after all looks very much like a business transaction. Ripa tells us of the case of a physician, whom he knew, whose only intercourse with a woman, with whom he lived, was viewing and fondling her feet. In most parts of China, and especially in the South, the relatives and friends of the bridegroom have a custom of examining on the day of marriage the feet of the bride. The smaller they are, the greater the rejoicings; and the fortunate husband, and the living and attentive parents of the bride, are highly congratulated. In the North of this province, in the district of Suen-hwa fu, there is said to be a custom among the inhabitants of holding, in the fifth month of each year, a sort of "Small Feet Exhibition." All classes of the people turn out in mass, and line the streets,

and fill the door ways, while the young and the married ladies strive with each other in the display of the smallest feet. This show takes place through the principal streets of the town.

The age at which the process of cramping commences varies with regard to the social status of the family. Some report bandaging at the age of three months, but this is evidently false. The usual period is from six, seven or eight years of age to thirteen or fourteen. The feet are bandaged afresh every day, and undone each night. Sleeping shoes, without soles, are worn at night to prevent the foot expanding. The cotton bandages are about six feet long, by three inches broad, and the edges are sometimes stitched to prevent their becoming loose. The greatest care in these respects is exercised by those who are anxious about their children, and love them very much. The feet often swell and suppurate, and these sores are difficult to heal, because they cannot intermit the bandaging. At night when unloosed, they are dusted with alum, to absorb the perspiration, or washed with millet spirit, to harden the skin. They do not, on the whole, seem to suffer much. It is somewhat wonderful that this severe and constant pressure, and suppuration in many cases, does not lead to disastrous results in the case of the serofulous and ill-conditioned. Custom and fashion oblige parents to conform to this practice, however much opposed to it, and however great their *true* love for their daughters. Three excellences are always held out to the little sufferers, which carry them through this severe hardship—viz., the fact that small feet are pretty, other people will admire them, and the certainty of getting good husbands, and being thereby introduced into a good family.

The fashionable size is about three inches, but oftener five, and sometimes seven. The size depends upon the time when it was begun, and the regularity and tightness with which it is maintained. The bandages are never left off; for, after the standard size has been obtained, they are still retained to to keep the shape, and give strength to the foot. Without them, walking would be impossible; the unbound and unsupported foot is too weak to support the superincumbent weight. The feet are never encased in iron shoes, as some have thought. Simple bandages are all that are employed, and are

so applied across the foot as to carry the second, third, and fourth toes and especially the fifth toe quite under the foot, and so to obtain the least possible breadth; and, by one or two turns of a figure-of-8 bandage, the foot is shortened, the heel is brought close to the ball of the big toe, and instead of forming an angle with the leg bones, it looks more like a continuation of them. The *os calcis*, from being horizontal, becomes vertical, and its posterior surface is brought to the ground. The bones of the instep are pushed out of their proper place, and made to bulge, thus giving a great prominence, and an arched crescentic form, resembling the new moon, to that part. The plantar concavity is therefore much exaggerated, and more or less filled with tough cellular tissue. The three points, then, upon which the foot rests, are the heel in its new position, the ball of great toe, and the fourth and fifth toes—their upper surface having now become part of the sole. The foot and leg are greatly atrophied, and the skin shrivelled. The leg tapers from the thigh joint to the foot, in the form of a cone, without the usual feminine risings and depressions, owing to the undeveloped calf; and that, again, is caused chiefly by want of exercise and proper motion to call these muscles into action. Were it from atrophy entirely, we should expect the limb to grow from bad to worse till it was entirely destroyed. The knee and ankle joints do not bend; all movement is from the thigh joint; the gait is mincing, with the arms slinging from side to side, and the body never straight or steady. They walk or stand, one might say, on their heels; and yet, from the nature of the shoe, with the heel one or two inches higher than the toes, they may be said to walk on their toes. The heel extends upwards and backwards beyond the heel of the shoe, sometimes, as in the larger, poorer and neglected foot, entirely outside the shoe, and projecting, as it were from the calf—thus showing a smaller foot than really is possessed. In this way, also, Chinese ladies look taller than they truly are.

PEKING, June, 1869.

(To be continued.)

PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN CHINA.

A letter to H. E. SIR RUTHERFORD ALCOCK, K. C. B., by the British Protestant Missionaries of Peking.

The following letter has been called forth by certain despatches sent home by Sir Rutherford Alcock last winter to H. M.'s government. As these despatches have not been published, an explanation of the circumstances under which the letter was written seems necessary.

Lord Clarendon, in speaking on the Chinese missionary question in the House of Lords on the 5th of April last, professed to give the opinion of Sir R. Alcock on this subject, "as the result of his great experience in China." The "opinion" seemed to embrace a variety of topics; but the two principal points of it were, that the Chinese were hostile to missionaries, and that "the missionaries should confine themselves to the treaty ports, exercising even there great judgment." In the vaguest way possible Lord Clarendon alluded to the French protectorate of Roman Catholic converts, the differences between the Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries, and the fear of the authorities that the missionaries would so influence the lower classes as to interfere with their local supremacy, as causes, in Sir Rutherford's opinion, of the hostility to missionaries. The restriction of Protestant missionaries was therefore absolutely necessary, to prevent our government being involved in a protectorate of them and their converts. According to Lord Clarendon, Sir Rutherford "doubted whether any prospect of success which the missionaries were entitled to entertain would compensate the dangers they incurred in disregarding not only the laws of the country, and the prejudices of the people, but the advice of their own government. Thus the British Minister was made to accuse the Protestant missionaries of "disregarding the laws of China!"

So loosely did Lord Clarendon give the substance of Sir R. Alcock's despatches, that the *Pall Mall Gazette*, in an article written just after the above debate, makes a ludicrous mistake with reference to one of the statements made in the House of Lords. Lord Clarendon had said that "quite recently a most offensive placard against the Roman Catholic religion had appear on the walls of Shanghai." He does not say who issued it, or what it contained. But the *Pall Mall Gazette*, without any hesitation, asserts that Sir Rutherford points to the Protestant Missionaries as the issuers of the placard in question. "It is easy to see," says the writer of the article, "that with converts of bad character, the consideration of protection by a foreign government may sometimes be of more weight than any purely theological motive, and the knowledge of this is not likely to dispose the local authorities to do anything to check the fanaticism occasionally provoked by some more than usually in-

judicious attack on the native religion. (Sic!) How certain it is that such attacks will from time to time be made may be gathered from one significant fact. 'Quite recently,' says Sir R. Alcock, 'a most offensive placard against the Roman Catholic religion appeared on the walls of Shanghai.' If the British Protestant cannot suppress his characteristic instincts even in the presence of a common adversary, he is not likely to show more decency in dealing with another form of Christianity." The *Pall Mall Gazette* certainly showed its "characteristic instincts" in attributing this placard to Protestant missionaries.

The above use of Sir R. Alcock's opinions and statements, both in the House of Lords and in the newspapers, seemed to call for some notice from those immediately concerned; and accordingly the English Protestant missionaries in Peking sent a private note to Sir Rutherford, requesting him to allow them a perusal of his recent despatches on the missionary question, that they might be able to judge for themselves as to the views and statements sent home by him officially to H. M. government. We at the same time told him that we did this with a view to probably addressing him officially on the subject of Protestant missions. In reply Sir Rutherford most courteously forwarded copious extracts from his despatches of December 4th, 1868, January 23rd and February 10th, 1869. In forwarding them, he said that we were not at liberty to publish them, but that "he had no objection whatever to our freely quoting anything he had said as the expression of opinions officially given by him to H. M. government, if we thought it necessary to combat them in communication with our friends at home, or in any statement which might be made to the government."

We read these extracts with care, and though we were unable to find any passage accusing us of "disregarding the laws of China," or of "issuing placards against the Roman Catholic religion," we were astonished to find various arguments brought forward to show that Christian missions are an obstacle to trade and peaceable intercourse with the Chinese, and that they ought by all means to be discouraged and restrained. We felt it would not be right to be silent under such a representation of Christian missions, officially sent to his government by H. M. Minister, and hence the letter which we have addressed to him, and which we now lay before the public.

Sir Rutherford has sent us a brief official reply, in which he declines to discuss the matter with us, but promises to forward a copy of our letter to H. M.'s Secretary of State, "accompanied by such comments as may seem necessary to correct errors of statement, and prevent misapprehension as to my views." "This is the more necessary," he adds, "as you have in not a few instances confounded together opinions and views conveyed in despatches to H. M. government as mine, with others for which I am not in any

way responsible, while you have at the same time drawn inferences supposed to be based on the former, which, even when separated from their context, they do not justify. As such a process is eminently calculated to mislead, I think it right to notify the fact in anticipation of your giving publicity to your letter."

We are glad to give as much publicity to this assertion of Sir Rutherford's as we do to our letter, though we cannot of course accept it until substantiated by proofs. We hope that if ever Sir Rutherford favours us with proofs of the truth of this charge, he will obtain for us from Lord Clarendon, or give to us himself if in his power, permission to publish in full the extracts from his despatches, to which in the main, our letter is an answer.

In the following letter we may seem to condemn all the forcible measures that have recently been taken in connection with missionaries in Yangchow and elsewhere. This is not the case. In common with almost every foreign resident in China, we feel largely indebted to Sir R. Alcock for his prompt and decisive action, especially in the Yangchow affair. It taught a lesson to unprincipled men, which they would probably never have learnt in any other way, and it effectually advanced the cause of foreign intercourse with China. It was rendered absolutely necessary by the hatred of the Chinese literati to *foreigners* (not to missionaries particularly), the impossibility of securing redress without force, and the safety of foreigners generally throughout China. What we object to is, that the missionaries when they meet with outrages and report them, as in duty bound, at the Consulates, should be told that they are applying for gunboats to help in carrying on their work, and that if they would cease going into the interior, the necessity for a gunboat would cease also. The outrages were perpetrated on them as foreigners, and had nothing to do with their peculiar calling. The missionaries, as such, are neither responsible for the outrages nor for the necessity of punishing them. They will do anything, to avoid these troubles, short of relinquishing their treaty right to settle in the interior.

The question now at issue is not how the missionary is to be kept out of China, or at least out of inland towns, in order that trade may prosper and be enlarged; but one of two alternatives—either, How may foreign nations be kept in check altogether, and be induced to prevent their subjects from intruding into the interior of China?—or, What means must be employed to induce the local mandarins and the native gentry to respect the treaties into which their government has entered with other countries, and to allow peaceable foreigners, engaged in a lawful calling, to reside among them? When it comes to be understood by Lord Clarendon, as it will be by and by, that the Chinese government is half, if not wholly, in sympathy with those local mandarins and native gentry in their opposition

to foreigners, and that the authority of the general government over their subordinates and the literati is at best a very questionable thing, it will then be seen that in certain extreme cases, such as that of Yangchow, if Rutherford Alcock's *action* is of more avail toward bringing the problem of foreign intercourse with China to a peaceable solution than all his *theorizing* about restricting missionaries to the treaty ports.

J. S. BURDON.

PEKING, July 23rd, 1869.

PEKING, July 14th, 1869.

To H. E. SIR RUTHERFORD ALCOCK, K. C. B.,
H. M. Envoy Extraordinary and Minister
Plenipotentiary, Peking.

Sir:—

In recent despatches to H. M. principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, quoted by Lord Clarendon in the House of Lords, and commented on by the leading English newspapers, you have entered somewhat at length into the subject of Protestant Missions in China; and we, Protestant Missionaries resident in Peking, desire to address you, and through you H. M. government, on some of the points brought forward by you.

These despatches, copious extracts from which you have courteously furnished us with, strongly advocate a restrictive policy with reference to Protestant missionary operations in the interior of China, principally on the ground of the "implacable hostility entertained by the Chinese authorities and the official class in China towards all missionaries," and also because of the injury that will accrue to our commercial relations with China, if missionaries are permitted to domicil themselves in the interior. If Lord Clarendon's speech in the House of Lords on the 5th of April last is rightly reported in the *London and China Express*, he states it as your opinion that "it is absolutely necessary that the missionaries should not establish themselves in the interior," and again that, "it is expedient that the missionaries should confine themselves to the treaty ports, exercising even there great judgment."

In regard to the first point, you have represented the arrogant pretensions of the Roman Catholic missionaries as one cause of hostility to all missionary labors. It is no doubt one cause, and we are as conscious of the mischief of such arrogance as your Excellency can be. But in giving the hostility of the Chinese to missionaries as a reason why Protestant missionaries should be restrained in their operations, the nature of that hostility, and the principal causes of it, should be distinctly mentioned.

It is well known and understood in China, that the hostility entertained by the Chinese to Protestant missionaries is not directed

against them as a class, but as foreigners. And the causes of that hostility are the hatred of other races which the Chinese have always had, the repeated defeats inflicted on the Chinese government by England, and the evils connected with the opium trade.

The Chinese look on missionaries as representatives of all foreigners; and all foreigners they believe to be encroachers on the rights of others, seekers after money and territory, or opium sellers. Almost every abusive placard that has been issued against Protestant missionaries has charged them either with secret designs of conquest or with being engaged in the coolie or opium trades, and making the teaching of virtue a cloak for these abominations. A missionary was not long ago driven out of a large city in the province of Honan by a mob, led on by the native gentry, the cause of whose hatred to him was given in these words, shouted after him as he left the city, "You burned our palace, you killed our Emperor, you sell poison to the people, and now you come professing to teach us virtue." These charges sufficiently indicate other and deeper, and to the Chinese more generally understood, causes of hostility than the pretensions of some Roman Catholic Bishops, or even the well known and much to be deplored protectorate of Chinese Christians by France. Such charges shew beyond a doubt that the Protestant missionary suffers not as a missionary, but as a foreigner. He suffers from a hostility which he has had no share in provoking. Mr. Taylor's expulsion from Yang-chow is a proof of this, inasmuch as the attack was made on him and his party before he had time to commence missionary operations. No general argument, then, against the establishment of Protestant missionaries in the interior can be founded on the troubles which Protestant missionaries have recently met with in certain inland towns.

You have directed Lord Clarendon's special attention to a placard which was posted towards the end of last year on the gates of Shanghai, which you think shows unmistakably "what are the prevailing opinions of the educated and official classes respecting Christianity as it has presented itself to their minds, and through them been conveyed to the common people, whom they lead." "It is only indeed," you further say, "by the light of such documents that we can see how it may be true, as has been said, that the minds of the Chinese are 'set like the nether millstone' against the teaching of missionaries." The contents of the placard will we hardly think bear out such a statement as this. It was directed principally against the Roman Catholics, and accused them of eating babies' flesh, and gouging out the eyes of the dying. This mode of attacking the Romish religion has become common on the part of the heathen Chinese for many years, and was by no means a new charge when the placard in question was issued. The same thing might occur in any city at any time. The ignorance of the native population leads to the belief of such stories. They have

arisen from the misunderstanding of the rites of baptism, the sacrament of the host, and extreme unction. The Protestant missionaries are of course classed with the Roman Catholics, and hence these foolish charges against us. The ruling classes know that these charges are false, but they invent them for the purpose of deluding the common people and stirring up their hatred to foreigners. They are of a piece with the notion held by some of the common people, and put forth some years ago in an anonymous placard posted on the walls of Ningpo and Hangchow, that foreign opium is made by pounding the bones and flesh and blood of coolies who have been stolen from China for this purpose, and are equally unworthy of grave consideration.

The injury that will accrue to our "material interests" in China, if missionaries are permitted to domicile themselves in the interior, you give as another reason for restraining them from doing so. "Commerce," you say, "its extension and free development, was the first great object of the treaty of Tientsin." "It is futile to graft on to a treaty of commerce a proselytizing agency for the conversion of the nation to Christianity." You entertain strong opinions against "the wisdom of present efforts for the establishment of Protestant missions beyond the circle of the ports." You "have no doubt whatever as to the risk incurred, and the evil consequences to be anticipated, from persistent efforts in this direction upon all material interests and progressive improvements, in our relations with the rulers and people of China."

As commerce is thus put in the foreground as the one only object of Great Britain in China, it is impossible to refrain from asking what has been the nature of that commerce which we have forced upon the Chinese? Has it been such as only to benefit the people, or has it been such as to demoralize them? We fear that the result of British commerce in China has rather had the latter effect than the former. The main branch of the British commerce in China is opium, an article which the Chinese believe to have been the cause of our first war with China; and which, however eagerly it may be sought after, they regard as injurious to them mentally, morally, and physically. Now, how does the trade in opium compare with that in tea and silk? It cannot surely be subject for self-congratulation, in the matter of our commerce with China, that there is very little difference annually between the total value of the opium imported from India into China and that of all the tea and silk exported from China to England and elsewhere. Let the following statistics speak for themselves:—

In 1857, the total amount of India opium imported into China was 83,143 piculs, 25,532 of which were smuggled into China from Hongkong. In silver the total value of this opium was Taels 45,071,357

In the same year (1867), the total amount of tea exported to all countries from China was 1,122,334 piculs, the value of which in silver was Taels 38,754,009

The total amount of silver exported to all countries from China during the same year was 39,299 piculs, the value of which in silver was Taels 15,724,380

Total value of tea and silk exported in 1867. Taels 49,478,389

This shows that the total value of the tea and silk exported from China to all countries in 1867 exceeded the total value of the one article of opium imported from India into China, chiefly by British merchants, during the same year, only by about four and a half millions of taels. Opium then may be considered as the main branch of British commerce in China, and however opinions may differ as to the amount of injury inflicted by this drug on those who use it, no one will defend it on the ground of its being in any sense beneficial to the people. The Chinese themselves, whether they use it or not, regard it as injurious. The enormous advance of the amount imported from India since the early years of its introduction is a cause, far more than a result, of the immense demand for it. It has given impetus to the growth of native opium, which (as in Szechuen) is gradually superseding the foreign article. Since the opening of the Yang-tsze, the native drug in the interior has become one half cheaper, and the number of smokers has been trebled. "The cultivation of the poppy," said one of the Censors in a memorial recently addressed to the Emperor on this subject, "has been substituted for cereal productions over vast tracts of the western and northern provinces, so as in some parts to occasion a rise in the price of food." For this and all other injuries entailed by opium, British commerce is responsible, and yet it is in the interests of British commerce that Protestant missionaries are to be restrained from penetrating into the interior! Missionary operations are represented as almost the one obstacle to "progressive improvements," while it is implied that commerce, if once freed from its connection with these operations, would only advance the cause of progress.

In opposition to this, we maintain that honourable commerce has nothing to fear from Protestant missionaries, but everything to gain. Merchants, as a rule, cannot make themselves understood among the people, as they but rarely learn their language; British officials, if they do know the language, mix but little among the native population. Protestant missionaries learn the language, mix with the people, and throw their influence all on the side of morality, peace and good will. They go about, not as represented, merely to proselytize to a certain "set of dogmas," but to teach all whom they can reach the first great principles of morality, and to explain

the desires and aims of the better portion of the English in coming among them. They have opened hospitals for the healing of the sick, and they frequently spend time and health and strength in ministering to the physical wants of the poor. They live among the Chinese on a friendly footing, diffuse information, receive the Chinese cheerfully in their houses, and constantly inculcate on them the practice of virtue and religion. The native women are visited by the wives of the missionaries, kindly intercourse is maintained, the hearts of the people are won; and England both in its lawful commerce and its political interests is only a gainer, never a loser, by the residence among the Chinese of the missionary families. The more there is of this sort of influence, the better it will be both for Chinese and English; and this will be especially the case in inland towns, where foreigners are only known as "devils" or "barbarians." To have mission hospitals and schools established in such cities, under the care of general and medical missionaries, well qualified by education, such as you have known during your long residence in China, would work well—if it might not be shown to be almost the only practical method—for the removal of prejudice and the spread of knowledge.

But we shall be told that, however beneficial the presence of missionaries might be in the interior, it almost inevitably brings with it complications between the native and foreign governments; but this is not, as we have shewn, because of the way in which missionaries propagate Christianity, nor is it on religious grounds at all, but simply because they are foreigners. The same troubles would have arisen, had a body of merchants or scientific men attempted to domicile themselves in those places out of which missionaries have recently been driven. Our merchants are urging freer access to the interior, and even permission to reside in inland towns for purposes of trade, and these demands cannot be put off much longer. When complications arise between merchants penetrating into the interior and the proud, ignorant ruling class, will the British Minister of that day argue that British commerce leads to the embroiling of the two governments, and advise that the merchants be confined again to the open ports?

Complication must arise from time to time in the opening up of this country to foreigners, and it rather becomes H. M. representatives in China to meet those difficulties, and to try every moral means to overcome them, than to advise retrogression in order to get rid of them. And they could not have a better opportunity of making this attempt than in dealing with the settling of missionaries in the interior. Protestant missionaries ask neither for "gunboats" nor soldiers to protect them. The use of force in connection with missionary operations is most abhorrent to their feelings. All they ask for is that their authorities—Minister in Peking and Consuls in the ports—will exert a friendly influence, so far as they

possibly can, on the Chinese rulers, to insist on protection being given to all British subjects travelling or residing in the interior, so long as they comply with the conditions of their passports. Sometimes this has been tried, and tried with success. A case in point occurred not far from Peking, about two years ago, in connection with the persecution of some native converts made by English Protestant missionaries. The British Consul at Tientsin asked Chung How, the imperial Superintendent of Foreign Trade in North China, to check the local magistrate, the Governor of Lau-ling, a city distant 170 miles from Tientsin, in his persecution of the native converts at that place. The Mission there was in a very flourishing state previous to this persecution, which was carried on by the magistrate at the instigation of the native gentry. A proclamation was very kindly sent to the neighborhood by Chung How, and the grievance ceased. If this can be done in the case of native converts who might be persecuted in such a variety of ways, without being able to appeal to law, we think that if perseveringly and earnestly tried in the case of British subjects, the same plan might also prove successful. At all events, if such means fail, missionaries generally, we feel confident, would rather retire to some other place than entail the horrors of war on any town. It is unjust to speak of missionaries as anxious to fall back on H. M. naval and military forces to help them in their work.

We must demur to your Excellency's statement that "the British authorities, as a rule, are neither consulted nor even advised by the missionaries of the steps the several independent members or bodies of diverse missions decide upon." Missionaries, as a rule, never travel without a passport, and this has always to be applied for at the Consulates. The Consuls therefore have every opportunity of enquiring into the movements of missionaries, on applying for their passports, and acquainting themselves, if they think fit, with the steps these missionaries intend to take. This system gives to H. M. government all the "direct control" that is necessary over their proceedings.

If it be asked on what grounds the Protestant missionaries claim the right of residence in the interior, and ask the British Minister and Consuls to help them to this in the way already indicated, we reply:

1. The Chinese government has as a matter of fact conceded to the Roman Catholic missionaries the right to go into the interior, and to settle themselves there for the purpose of teaching their religion, and by the "favoured nation" clause in the English treaty, the same right is ceded to the English missionaries. Although this concession is not found in the French text of the French treaty, and although for political reasons the Chinese government would, as is well known, be glad if it could be withdrawn, it is a fact that the French missionaries are allowed this privilege;

and you have yourself argued that what the French missionaries enjoy cannot, according to treaty, be denied by the Chinese authorities to the British.

2. It is well known that the present policy of the Chinese government, during the remainder of the Emperor's minority, is neither to recede nor to advance. Anxious to leave the responsibility of new changes with the Emperor himself, they wish to persuade the treaty powers to wait a few years before introducing any new principles into the relations of the countries. Hence you have said to Lord Clarendon that the imperial government has no wish to withdraw, at least on religious grounds, the right conceded to missionaries.

3. The Chinese government by their Ambassador, the Hon. Anson Burlingame, has announced to different western powers the principle of entire reciprocity, as that on which they desire henceforth to conduct their intercourse with friendly foreign nations. This certainly implies as much liberty to the foreigner in China, as is granted the Chinese in the West. Mr. Burlingame further explained and illustrated this new Chinese policy in his famous New York speech, in which so far as missionaries are concerned, he said that "China invited Protestant missionaries to plant the shining cross on every hill and in every valley." As this and similar assertions by the Chinese Envoy have produced fruit in the action of the British government towards its subjects in China, we are entitled either to ask the Chinese government to repudiate Mr. Burlingame's treaties and speeches, or to claim from them the benefit of his public declarations.

We would gladly stop here, believing that we have sufficiently vindicated the beneficial nature of Protestant missions, and their right, in accordance with the existing condition of things in China to establish in the interior. But you have thought good, in enforcing your opinion "of the necessary connection of missionary labour with commercial interests, as an obstacle to progress and improved political relations," to allude to several points in connection with Protestant missionaries—their faulty mode of procedure, their imperfections, their disputes with each other and with the Roman Catholic missionaries, their sympathy with the Taiping rebels, and the revolutionary nature of the doctrines which they teach—as proofs that "no good can come out of such instrumentality." You cannot be surprised that we entirely disagree with you in this conclusion, and we think we can show that your premises, on which you ground your conclusion, cannot be sustained.

You have conveyed the impression to H. M. government that Protestant missionaries make no attempt to reach the ruling class in China. This is an opinion that has been dwelt upon lately in certain circles until it has come to be accepted almost as an undoubted fact. We assert on the other hand that it is *not* a fact, and mention in proof of our assertion that

nearly a hundred works on science, medicine, history, geography, law, and miscellaneous subjects, have been published in China by Protestant missionaries. These works have been composed in a style so acceptable to the learned class, that men belonging to this class, when acting as Governors and Viceroys, have reprinted at their own expense not a few of them, thus adding them to the permanent literature of the country. The missionaries then have not neglected the higher classes, but have already succeeded in interesting no small number among them in various departments of knowledge. In the translation of works adapted to this end, the object has been to inform the minds of the Chinese, so as to remove their prejudices, to induce them to think with candour, and thus pave the way for presenting Christianity to their attention.

In connection with the above charge, we have often heard of late that missionaries are only half-educated men. You yourself have spoken of missionaries in terms that would suggest such a charge as this, when you speak of the "human instruments brought to bear upon the Chinese people for their conversion" as "seemingly ill-adapted to secure the end proposed." "It is vain to hope," you continue, "for the conversion of a shrewd, rationalistic and sceptical nation like the Chinese by instrumentality so imperfect." Whether you intended this to convey the impression that these "human instruments" were "imperfectly" educated, or not, is not very clear; but it is a fact that from this and similar statements the whole Protestant missionary body has been so represented in the *Times*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and other newspapers. Will the following facts bear out the charge? All the Chinese dictionaries yet made for English students of Chinese are the work of Protestant missionaries; the conductors of and principal writers in the *Chinese Repository*, an invaluable mine of information on almost every Chinese subject, highly prized by all who wish to become acquainted with this country, were Protestant missionaries; the author of one of the best works on China, "The Middle Kingdom," taken as a text book among the student interpreters of the British Legation, was a Protestant missionary; the translator of the Chinese Classics is a Protestant missionary; the translator into Chinese of Wheaton's International Law, whose work was printed at the expense of the Chinese government, is a Protestant missionary. One of the principal Professorships in the new University which the Chinese government are said to be desirous of establishing in Peking is filled by a Protestant missionary. The only writers in Chinese on subjects that will elevate this people morally and intellectually are missionaries. Is this class of men worthy to be branded in the House of Lords as "rascals" or "enthusiasts," and in the leading English newspapers as ignorant, or at best half-educated men?

Lord Clarendon has represented you as stating that there are "great differences"

(by which we suppose disputes and bickerings are meant) between the Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries, and he refers to certain "unseemly instances" of these "differences," which you have given in your despatches.

We know of no such disputes between Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries. Mr. Wylie, in his memorials of the Protestant missionaries, recently published, gives a list of nearly 700 publications in China by those missionaries, living and dead. Among these there is none directed specially against Roman Catholic missionaries. The instances given do not bear out the charge of disputes.

The first is, that an objection was made by M. Simon, French Vice-Consul at Ningpo, to the Pilgrim's Progress, translated some years ago into Chinese by the Rev. W. C. Burns, now deceased. This work of Bunyan, teaching Christianity by means of an allegory, being a remarkable work of genius, and a highly useful exponent of Christianity, has been translated into a large number of languages, and it has never been thought necessary to expunge those passages, few and brief, which refer to the Roman Catholics. M. Simon thought that one passage spoke disrespectfully of the Pope, and made an official complaint to the British authorities on this account. Surely this is no proof of bickerings between Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries. Sensible Roman Catholics themselves would ridicule such a complaint as foolish and paltry, for which M. Simon is alone responsible.

The second instance was a denunciation of Protestant books by Roman Catholic authority in China. It was stated that the books of the Protestants were "obscene," and that the readers and authors were all in danger of damnation. This again is rather an instance of intemperate language used by an individual, provoked apparently by the rapid spread of Protestant Christianity in his neighborhood, than proof of disputes between Protestants and Romanists. Such injudicious persons are to be found everywhere, and it is most unfair, on their account, to involve both bodies in one sweeping condemnation, when you say that the above immoderate language "justifies the conclusion that sectarian hatreds, rather than Christianity, must be the result of such teaching on either side"—as if this was the constant teaching of one or of both sides!

With reference to the disputes of missionaries as to the best term by which to express the name of God in Chinese, we can only record our surprise at finding such an argument brought forward at all against missionaries.

We have much that we could say on the subject, but we refrain from entering on it, as we do not see what the British government can have to do with our discussions on a purely philological question.

You have further alluded, in strong terms of condemnation, to the sympathy which many of the Protestant missionaries manifested toward the Taiping rebels. But British naval officers, and British Consuls, and even the then Governor of Hongkong, are involved in the same condemnation. The profession of Christianity by a body of men who marched through the country from Canton to Nanking without one single check, and gave out as their object the subversion of the reigning dynasty, was enough to startle all foreign residents into inquiring into the meaning of such profession. And it did so. Naval officers, Consuls, the British government, the general public, were all interested in, and more or less sympathized at first with, the movement. It would have been strange indeed had missionaries stood aloof from it. It was principally through missionaries that information respecting the self-styled Christian views of the Taipings was looked for and obtained, and it will be in your recollection that Lord Clarendon sent his thanks to Dr. Medhurst for his translation of certain tracts and papers issued by the insurgents. When the nature of the movement became more plain, comparatively few of the missionaries hoped anything from it, and but one allied himself with it. Is the whole body to be held responsible for any want of judgment in one, or at most in two or three, of its members? It is utterly unfair to speak of the whole body of Protestant missionaries as "hailing the Taipings as heralds of Christianity," or as men who will render "sympathy to the first band of pirates and robbers who can gather elements of disturbance about them." Such a sweeping condemnation condemns itself.

In your despatch of December 4th you dwell much on the political and revolutionary tendencies of Christianity, and argue that as the missionary, from the very nature of the doctrines he teaches, must of necessity teach revolution, he ought to be restrained from going into the interior; and you leave the impression on the reader of your despatch that you think it would be decidedly for the peace of China, if Christianity and its emissaries were excluded altogether from the country.

It is an old accusation against Christianity on the part of the heathen that it teaches revolution, but by this they mean only one aspect of revolution, namely *sedition*. Christ himself was accused of "stirring up sedition."

His apostles also had to meet the charge, although we find in their writings the enforcement on their converts, in the strongest possible way, of obedience to the "powers that be." When the Chinese accuse Christianity of being revolutionary, they also mean that it teaches sedition. Now we know this is untrue. Christianity may be revolutionary of customs and opinions, but it is not seditious. The heathen have made this mistake because of their ignorance of responsibility to a divine power, and their inability to comprehend the principle that "God must be obeyed before men." But the ignorance of the heathen on this point constitutes the very ground of missions. Men must be taught that there is a divine power in the world, and that all, without exception, are responsible to it. Surely no Christian man or Christian government can be opposed to this, or forbid missionaries to preach Christianity, because the heathen entertain an ignorant objection to it, which has no foundation in fact. And yet, from your despatch, you seem to think it is a valid objection.

But whilst we contend that the Chinese view of Christianity being revolutionary is wrong, and therefore no argument against missions, we are free to acknowledge that Christianity does produce revolutions. It would be worth very little, if it did not revolutionize the countries which accept it. But the very presence of Anglo-Saxons in the East is revolutionary, and therefore we are warranted in arguing that if Christianity is to be banished because of its tendency to produce changes, the British and American governments ought to recall every Anglo-Saxon in China.

Whether it arises from his religion or his civilization, or from something inherent in his race, the Anglo-Saxon, wherever he goes among the semi-civilized pagan nations of the east, is sure, sooner or later, to produce a revolution. This has been seen in India, in China, and in Japan; and in each case the revolution, whether complete or partial, has been unconnected with missionaries. The East India Company zealously excluded missionaries from India at first, and yet were the means of subverting every native government. In Japan, missionaries have not been allowed to propagate Christianity since its recent opening to foreign intercourse; and yet it is a significant fact that within ten years of this event a great revolution has taken place in the government of that country. In China, changes have been made that are equivalent to a revolution. The reigning dynasty was at one time all but overthrown; and if it has now any strength, it is all owing to the influence of those very for-

eign powers that had well nigh caused its overthrow.

If the despotic governments of the east are to be left unimpaired, if nothing must be done which is at all likely to interfere with the ideas on which they are founded, then we have no right to bring to China the laws or the commerce of Christendom, and force the Chinese to accept them. Both are revolutionary in such countries as China and Japan. Both break up the established order of things. Both introduce elements of western progress utterly uncongenial with, or rather hostile to the stagnation of eastern pagan despotisms. The settlement in Peking of a British Minister, at the point of the bayonet, and the demand that he shall be treated as ambassadors in the west are treated, are far more subversive of all the Chinese ideas of government than the teaching of missionaries.

Are we wrong then in having come to China? Must we apologise to the Chinese for all the defeats we have inflicted on them, and the changes we have made amongst them socially and politically, and forthwith take our departure? Are the British government likely to repent of all the injury they have done to Chinese exclusiveness and pride, and to withdraw all their officials and their subjects from China, on the ground that our presence here is revolutionary? Shall we not rather be told that it is too late now even to moot the question whether western nations ought or ought not to force their intercourse on an unwilling heathen people? The thing has been done, is being done, and will continue to be done. The nations of the west seem to be brought hither by a necessity over which they have no controul. They bring their commerce, their civilization and their religion with them; and it is beating the air to argue against the introduction of them, simply because they will produce revolutions.

China, it is admitted on all hands, needs a revolution. Its ignorance, its superstitions, its pride, its exclusiveness—all require to be changed. Until this is done, foreign intercourse of any kind will be a perpetual source of danger to individuals, and of complications between the governments. The Christian religion is the only means by which such a change can be brought about, and in due time it will effect this change in China, as it has done in the nations of the west. Its propagators, so long as they cannot be proved to be breaking the laws of China, ask only that no hindrances shall be thrown in

the way of Christianity, and in the long run it will be found that even the "material interests" of Great Britain in China will by this course be advanced.

We are,

Sir,

Your most obedient servants,

(Signed) JOSEPH EDKINS, Missionary of the London Missionary Society.

JOHN S. BURDON, Missionary of the Church Missionary Society.

WILLIAM H. COLLINS, Missionary of the Church Missionary Society.

JOHN DUDGEON, Medical Missionary of the London Missionary Society.

[From the *North China Herald*.]

THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT AND MISSIONS.

We subjoin a translation of a memorial lately addressed by the Tsung-li yamén to the Emperor regarding missionary complications that have arisen in various parts of China, and of the Emperor's reply. It will be seen that the tone of both is in favour of fair treatment.

"[The Board of Foreign Affairs humbly] report that, in reference to certain cases connected with the propagation of religion in Ho-nan, Kiang-su, and Fuh-kien provinces, in the disposition of which Chinese and foreigners have not been able to agree, they have taken the circumstances into careful consideration, and now reverently offer this secret memorial, humbly begging for it the imperial perusal. They find that, in the English and French treaties of the 8th year of Hien-Fung, it is provided that those who teach and practice the Protestant and Roman Catholic religions in China, must be afforded complete protection, without the least ill-treatment, hindrance, or obstruction. In the 10th year of Hien Fung, after the treaty had been revised and its provisions agreed upon, your ministers [the memorialists], taking it up, and seeing clearly that, as the Christian religion did not agree with those of China, its introduction would be attended with great difficulties, made inquiries of and discussed the subject [with the contracting parties]; and, as both sides adhered to their own views, were still unwilling lightly to ratify it by exchange of copies. Circumstances

becoming urgent however, and all classes advising and pressing to exchange, we had no alternative but to complete the business by yielding this point, in doing which we had regard to the higher good.

Now since the ratification, no matter how it might prick the hand, it was obligatory, whenever a case arose, to deliberate on it, enquire into the circumstances and principles involved, and so dispose of it as to secure the right. Recently, however, in the provinces, in cases growing out of this religion, several years have been suffered to pass without a final settlement; and through these long delays they have taken a hundred different complications.

Among these are cases in which the troubles have sprung from converts who, relying on foreign power, have grown boasting and arrogant, and sought to gratify their spites; others, in which the soldiers and people themselves, excited beyond measure, have given occasions for quarrel, so that there could not fail to be something found for foreign nations to lay hold of.

Thus, lately, we have repeatedly received despatches in regard to the restoration of a Church building at Nau-yang, in the province of Ho-nan, from the Governor Li-hoh-nien, in which, he says that, it being a matter in which the treaty is concerned, he did not dare by steadily following public opinion, however right that might be, to seek the praise of the gentry and citizens; nor did he dare, on the other hand, to slur over the matter and deceive the Emperor, and thus endanger the public weal. He informs us, too, that the people of Nau-yang have circulated [inflammatory] cards, with the design of calling together the masses, who have assumed a most threatening aspect, and that he was now still expediting measures to settle the difficulty. Again, at Yang-chow, in Kiang-su, the people had collected together and beaten and insulted a Christian teacher [or teachers]; and at Tai-wan in the jurisdiction of Fuh-kien, some braves had killed a convert. Despatches had been received from the Viceroy, Tseng-kwo-fan, saying that he had already examined into the Yang-chow affair, and got hold of its leading characteristics; but nothing has been yet received from the Viceroy, Ying-kwei, to show how he had dealt with the affair at Tai-wan. In the meantime, the minister of the kingdom concerned has a number of times sent despatches to us, the spirit and language of which are most urgent and determined, asking that the leaders of these malefactors be apprehended and dealt with. English men-of-war too have gone to both Yang-chow and Tai-wan for the purpose, as they allege, of putting down the disturbance themselves.

Deeply fearing therefore lest affairs should come to such a pass that it would be difficult to right them, we have on the one hand, in our replies to the ministers of the nations concerned, who reside in our capital, requested them to call on their Consuls to settle these affairs amicably, and on the other, have sent instructions, post haste, to Tseng-kwo-fan and Ying-kwei, to appoint officers of the high rank of Fantai and Tautai, and conversant with foreign affairs, to meet and advise with the Consuls of those places, and settle these affairs at once, so that the Chinese and foreigners may live in mutual peace and the growth of further disorder be prevented.

Your ministers humbly think that, as the teaching of the Christian religions has already been sanctioned by the treaties, and still more as the demands upon us have been in accordance with the treaties, it would be difficult to oppose it openly. Still we have, in the careful inculcation of correct doctrine, a power which will of itself direct aright the course of the people. It is not necessary then to lade out the hot water, to stop the boiling. The more excited men become, the more persistent they are in their own views. Hence, your ministers, when they meet with any affair in which the Christian religion is involved will, in every case, as soon as despatches have been received from the foreign ministers it may concern, at once send orders to the province where it occurred requiring impartial action upon it. But the justice and injustice of either side, or the truth or falsehood of the circumstances in any individual case, your ministers at this distance can have no means of ascertaining; it must rest wholly with the higher officers of the various provinces, in conjunction with the local authorities, to look at the circumstances and rectify the difficulty accordingly; to do at once, and thoroughly, what ought to be done, and show clearly from the treaty what is to be refused, and thus not only avoid delays, but further troubles growing out of them. We must beg therefore the imperial decree requiring Tseng-kwo-fan, lately appointed Governor-general of Chih-li, formerly Governor-general of the two Kiangs, Ying-kwei, Governor-general of Fuh-kien and Cheh-kiang, and Li-hoh-nien, Governor of Ho-nan, severally, to take up at once any unfinished litigation connected with this religion, and use all dispatch in devising schemes to bring them to an issue. We further beg the imperial edict requiring the Tartar Generals, the Governor-generals, and Governors, in each province, to inform the various local authorities, that if there be foreigners engaged in disseminating Christianity, they must command the scholars and people to attend each to his own affairs, to pay no heed

to flying rumours, and to abstain from gratuitous criminations; that should any Christian teachers depart from their vocation and create disturbances among the people, they must at once inform their Consuls, that they may be dealt with according to the treaty, that the people at large and the Christian converts may live together in harmony, and all difficulties be kept from growing into large proportions; and so, by putting at rest all these religious litigations, cut off all occasion of dissension.

Your ministers having deliberated upon the origin and nature of these religious troubles, it is but proper for us reverently to offer this secret memorial. We humbly beg the Empress dowager and Emperor's instructions, which we will use all diligence in obeying.

The Emperor's will will be given separately.

In the 7th year of Tung Chi, 9th month, and 24th day, the Cabinet Ministers received the imperial decree as follows: A memorial from the Board of Foreign Affairs in relation to certain cases connected with the propagation of religion in Ho-nan, Kiang-su, and Fuh-kien provinces, in which Chinese and foreigners have not been able to agree, makes mention of a case relating to a church building at Nan-yang, in the province of Ho-nan, in which the people circulated cards with the design of calling together the masses, who have assumed a most threatening aspect; of a case at Yang-chow, in the province of Kiang-su, in which the people collected together, and beat and insulted a Christian teacher, and which Tseng-kwo-fan had informed them he had inquired into, and got hold of its leading characteristics; of another at Tai-wan, in which some braves had killed a Christian convert, and in relation to which no despatches have yet been received from Ying-kwei as to how he was going to deal with it; that in the meantime the minister of the kingdom concerned has frequently, in most urgent language, requested that the leaders of these malefactors be apprehended and dealt with; that as the matter of the propagation of Christianity has already been fixed in the treaty, it would be very difficult to hinder it openly, but that to direct our own course, to follow the right and reject the wrong, lies wholly within ourselves; that at present in dealing with these various cases careful deliberation is indispensable, that what is proper to be done should be done at once, and that what must be refused be clearly shown from the treaty, so that protracted delays and further complications growing out of them, may be prevented; and that thus finally the cause of good order

can be maintained. I therefore direct Tseng-kwo-fan, Ying-kwei, Ma-sin-i, Ting-jih-chang, Pien-pau-ti, and Li-ho-nien, severally, to take up these unfinished religious litigations, and hasten to devise schemes for their final settlement, and that they do this without the least partiality or connivance with wrong, which would prevent the attainment of present justice, and prove a fertile source of future evils.

I direct that copies of the original memorial be made and given to the officers mentioned for their perusal.

By command of the Emperor.

AMERICAN AND CHINESE "RECIPROCITY."

The following letter was some time ago forwarded by an American missionary to the Hon. J. Ross Browne, then U. S. Minister at Peking:—

NINGPO, June 10th, 1869.

Hon. J. Ross Browne,
U. S. Minister, &c., &c.

Dear Sir:—

A short time since, the American missionaries of this port forwarded a petition to your Excellency, requesting the insertion in the revised treaty, of a clause requiring protection for those who rent us houses, which I trust you have received.

We have since been conversing upon another important consideration which was not mentioned in our petition, and which, while it does not seem to require a united petition, I wish still to urge upon your attention.

This seems the more important since the British government (influenced by the representations, or rather misrepresentations, of Sir Rutherford Alcock) appears disposed to withdraw all protection from residents in the interior, taking in fact a retrograde step. This measure, if carried out, will be sure to make those officials and literati who are opposed to foreigners all the more bold and contumacious, which spirit will soon manifest itself even at the open ports, and render the carrying out of the treaties still more difficult. Should that policy result in the driving of the numerous Protestant missionary establishments from the interior, where they were peacefully formed under the provisions of the treaties of 1858, with the knowledge and consent of the foreign Consuls and native officials, the result would be to put back the friendly relations of the Chinese with foreigners more than twenty years. Foreigners, whether merchants or missionaries (the officials who are unfriendly do not distinguish), could not then travel in the interior even the shortest distance, much less reside there, with any assurance of safety. That the present policy of the British government, as intimated in the Formosa case, tends

to such a result, there can be no doubt in the minds of those intimately acquainted with the Chinese character and feeling towards foreigners. And should this policy be concurred in by other foreign governments, no doubt the results would be most disastrous, not only to foreigners resident in the interior, but also to the peace of those residing at the open ports —i. e., unless the foreign governments insist upon the *central government* at Peking compelling the *provincial officials* to observe the stipulations of the treaties, and to *protect foreigners* in their treaty rights, privileges, and immunities. This appears now to be the policy which the Chinese government has entered upon, at least ostensibly; and it remains to be seen whether it will faithfully put it into execution. Having the power to appoint and dismiss all provincial officers, the central government has the power to compel them to observe the treaties, if it so wills.

The point to notice which I took up my pen, and to which I wish especially to call your Excellency's attention, is the *reciprocal privileges* to be enjoyed by the Chinese in the United States, and by citizens of the United States in China, according to the principles laid down in the supplementary treaty recently agreed upon with the Chinese Embassy at Washington, particularly in articles 4, 5, and 6.

Art. 4 reaffirms the 29th article of the treaty of 1858, which stipulates for "the exemption of Christian citizens of the U. S. and Chinese converts from persecution in (without limit as to place) China on account of their faith," and agrees that citizens residing in each others' countries "shall enjoy entire liberty of conscience, and shall be exempt from all disability or persecution on account of their religious faith or worship in either country." This, I suppose, allows Chinese to lease or purchase land and erect temples wherever they wish in the United States, and there perform their worship, and if citizens of the U. S. choose, they may worship with them, without molestation; on the other hand, citizens of the U. S. may in the same way lease or purchase land and build chapels wherever they wish in China, and there worship, and if Chinese wish to worship with them, they can do so—there is to be no molestation.

Art. 5 "recognizes the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and his allegiance, and also the mutual advantages of the free migration and immigration of their citizens and subjects respectively from the one country to the other, for purposes of curiosity, trade, or as permanent residents."

Art. 6 stipulates that "citizens visiting or residing" in each others' respective countries "shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, or exemptions in respect to travel or residence as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation," "naturalization" excepted. This article of course gives Chinese perfect freedom of travel and residence throughout the U. S., and it gives to citizens of the U. S. the same right to travel, lease or purchase land, form missionary estab-

lishments, &c., that is enjoyed by Frenchmen, Italians and Spaniards.

If the object of this treaty, and of these articles in particular, is not to lay down the doctrine of *perfectly reciprocal privileges and benefits*, accruing to citizens resident in each others' respective countries, then I see not the meaning of the language employed, nor the object in view.

Mr. Burlingame's explanation of the object of the Embassy confirms the correctness of this interpretation of the treaty. He says, in his "New York speech," "She (China) comes with your international law. She tells you that she is willing to abide by its provisions; that she is willing to take its obligations for its privileges." "She invites your merchants; she invites your missionaries, and tells them to plant the shining cross on every hill and in every valley; for she is hospitable to fair argument." "The country is open; you may travel and trade *where you like*." "She has no hostility to you." "What she asks is, that you will be *as kind to her people as she is to yours*."

Reciprocal privileges then being the prime object of the treaty, what are the privileges, immunities, and exemptions, in respect to travel, residence, leasing or purchasing lands and houses, and other advantages, which the Chinese government is in duty bound to accord to citizens of the U. S. resident in China? Evidently they are the same that the U. S. government accords to Chinese resident in the United States. If it is the real intent of the Chinese government to have China assume a place in the family of civilized nations, and establish in good faith treaties of reciprocity, I see not how by any sophistry it can refuse to act according to the above rule. If it is not willing to grant reciprocal privileges, then let it not claim for China a place in the comity of nations, let it recall its embassadors, and annul its recent treaties. If the Chinese government grants the most perfect reciprocal privileges of which it is capable, there will still be great inequality. For Chinese in the United States will enjoy all the advantages and appliances of a highly civilized and enlightened state of society, of just laws and an equitable government; while citizens of the U. S. in China, must be subject to all the disadvantages and inconveniences of a very low state of civilization, of antiquated or unjust laws, and a government in its practical workings but little removed from barbarism.

In case of an outrage upon foreigners, if the Chinese government pleads that it cannot control the provincial officers nor the people, so as to prevent outrages, or at least secure redress when they have occurred, then it is virtually a confession of its incapacity to maintain treaties of reciprocity with civilized nations, and it must in that case be dealt with as other half-civilized and barbarous nations are; foreign governments must take the protection of their citizens into their own hands, and seek redress of the actual parties who commit the outrage.

If the above is a correct view of the new position that China has assumed towards foreign nations, then the policy to be insisted upon in the revised treaty, and in the treatment of U. S. citizens resident in China, is perfectly plain, and contained in a nutshell—*perfectly reciprocal privileges*—i. e., citizens of the United States in China shall have the same privileges, freedom, and protection that the Chinese enjoy in the United States. And the central government at Peking is bound to see that the provincial officers secure to U. S. citizens, wherever they are in the empire, their treaty rights and privileges.

At the present time it is evident that there are many provincial officials and gentry who are determined, if possible, to keep all foreigners from residing in the interior; hence the importance of increased vigilance in maintaining our treaty rights. Only a few days since, a house leased in King-hwa fu, and the rent paid for a year in advance, by an American missionary, was torn down by a mob raised by the literati, after having, it is said, compelled the owner to sell them the house. The missionary was to take possession the next day, and it was understood on all hands by the people, that the express object of the literati was to prevent the foreigner from occupying the house, and eventually drive him from the city, where for several years he has had a small leased room for his occupancy when visiting the city. Outside the city, in the villages, are over twenty native Christians, several of them literary men, who if the missionary is driven away will be exposed to persecution.

The above considerations I respectfully submit for your Excellency's carefully consideration; and should the policy here suggested commend itself to your judgment as correct, then I trust that you will insist at all hazards upon the Chinese government's acting according to it in practice.

Yours respectfully,

* * *

CREEDS IN CHINA.

BY F. PORTER SMITH, M. B.

Confucianism 儒教.

Buddhism 釋教.

Tauism 道教.

Nestorianism 景教.

Mahomedanism 回教門.

Judaism 刀筋教.

Romanism 天主教.

The Parsee religion 火神教.

The religion of Zoroaster, as em-

bodied in the Zendavesta 波斯經教.

The Manichaean doctrine 魔尼教. The doctrine of Jesus Christ 耶穌聖教.

Nestorians were sometimes called 大秦 *Ta ts'in*, or Syrians, and they shared with the Jews the designation of 天竺教 *Tien chuh kiau*, or the "Syrian doctrine."

Mahomedans were also called 穆民 *Moh-min*, after their founder, and 紅毛回子 *Hung-mau-hwui-ts'z*, to distinguish them from the Jews, sometimes called 藍毛回子 *Lan-mau-hwui-ts'z*, or "Blue-capped hwui-ts'z." It happened that most of the Mahomedans who came first to China were Turkmans, or Teisl-bashes, from the north of Persia, &c., whose distinctive mark was the "fez," as their name (Qazal-bashi—i. e., red-caps) signified. The Jews came first to China by way of Persia.

The Jewish faith was also called by a wealth of other names, such as 天教 *Tien-kiau*, "Heaven's religion;" 犹教 *Hien-kiau*; 一賜樂業教 *Yih-ts'z-loh-niich-kiau*, or "Israelitish religion;" 清真教 *Tsing-chin kiau*, "Religion of Purity and Truth," &c.

Romanism was sometimes appropriately called 十字教 *Shih-ts'z-kiau*, "the Religion of the Crucifix."

Jesuits employed the term 耶穌會士 *Ye-su-hirui-ts'z*, or "Doctors of the Society of Jesus."

Of the weak side of Protestantism, as professed by the *various* branches of the Christian Church, planted in China, separated by differences of origin and organization, and "divisions about purifying," we rather need *forsaking* than *confessing* what is sinful in this matter.

It only concerns us to protest against the effort to express these unfortunate distinctions of sects in bad Chinese, for the perpetuation of one of the worst evils of organized Christianity.

CORRESPONDENCE.

HON. J. ROSS BROWNE ON MISSIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHINESE RECORDER: —

In May last, the American missionaries at Ningpo petitioned the U. S. Minister, Hon. J. Ross Browne, "to secure if possible the insertion, in that article of the revised treaty relating to the rental of houses and lands, a clause to this effect viz.: All persons renting houses or lots to American missionaries, shall not, on account of such rental, be molested in either person or property; and if molested, it shall be the duty of the local officers to afford them protection, and punish the offenders."

The occasion of this petition was the fact that several cases had recently occurred in which the renters of houses had been intimidated by threats and abuse, so as to either be not willing to rent to American missionaries, or to refuse the occupancy of premises already rented.

I copy from Hon. Mr. Browne's reply to the petition, and letters accompanying it, the following extracts, — "Your favors of recent date with memorial of the Ningpo missionaries reached me at Peking, and I at once gave attention to their contents.

"I agree with you entirely on the question of reciprocity. I endorse every one of your arguments, and all your statements of facts. Your memorial and letters are now on the way to Washington, with my most cordial endorsement. * * *

"From my first dispatches, I have sustained the missionaries; but as I became better acquainted with them, and saw something of their unselfish zeal, I took up their cause with all my energy. At first I thought it would be better for them not to press too hard against native prejudices, or incur risks by pushing too vigorously into the interior; but I soon gave that up as untenable, and entirely inconsistent with the object in view — viz., the conversion of a heathen and degraded race. Opposition must be expected, and must be overcome. It will never be overcome by standing still or retreating. This I have urged in all my later dispatches during the past six months. * * *

"I think it would help the cause, for all the missionaries in China to make a similar demonstration to that just now made by the merchants" (at Shanghai.)

This last suggestion is a good one. Would it not be well for the American missionaries at each of the ports to forward memorials to the newly appointed Minister, Hon. Mr. Howard, immediately on his arrival in China?

Yours very truly,
M. J. KNOWLTON.

NINGPO, July 27th, 1869.

[In addition to the above, we make the following extract from a private letter from Peking, in which reference is made to an interview between Mr. Browne and several missionaries at the capital.—ED. RECORDER.]

"He said he believed in missionaries for two reasons — first, because, having met with a large proportion of them in China, he found them to be generally earnest, zealous, intelligent men, teaching the principles of that Christianity to which all civilization owes its elevation and refinement; secondly, because the missionaries represent the element of *progress*. These opinions he has well elaborated in his dispatches to the Secretary of State, as well as plainly exhibiting the duplicity and evident want of honor among Chinese officials, not passing lightly over the greatest of humbugs — the Burlingame Mission. If his dispatches are published and circulated through the country, as they well deserve to be, they will enlighten the public mind on matters in regard to which people in England and America are lamentably ignorant. His own view seems to be that the only way in which any permanent results can be effected is by giving correct information to the *people*, and especially through those interested in missions; so that they will then send their representatives to Congress with a proper understanding of matters. He has taken especial pains to make himself acquainted with not only the movements of Protestant missions, but has also thoroughly investigated the history of the Roman Catholics in China. One of the first cases he had was where a missionary had suffered some evident injury or persecution. He promptly referred the case to the Foreign Office here, and was advised that it should meet with prompt investigation, &c. A few months passed, and they reported that they had made the proper inquiries, and found that the statement of the missionary was correct, and they had punished those in authority at the place, and now all was quiet. Mr. Browne, curious to know the extent of reparation, wrote to the Consul about it, and from him learned that *nothing* had been done, not even the investigation. So much for the promises and reliability of mandarins.

"In writing to the Secretary of State, he enclosed a memorial from the American missionaries at Ningpo in reference to securing protection for the Chinese who rent us houses, and a private letter from Mr. Knowlton, urging enforcement of the reciprocal provisions of the new treaty, whereby an American shall enjoy the same privileges in China that a Chinaman does in America, in reference to religious belief, traveling, residence, &c. Mr. Browne called attention to

the fact that there are five Buddhist temples in San Francisco.

"His version of the Yangchow, Formosa and other troubles, though not the popular one, nor the one likely to be most pleasing to the government at this time, is I think the proper one—the opposition is not against missionaries as such, nor against Christianity, but against foreigners. He considers the question of protecting missionaries rather difficult, not doubting that they should be protected; but this also included, or implied, a certain amount of protection for their work. And I am sorry he was not a little more explicit just here, or that I had not better understood him. He thinks the boasted progress China has made within the last fifty years, whatever it has been, has been the result of force. He thinks the highest civilization has been committed by Providence to a few powerful nations, and they must extend it over the world, by force if need be; much more reasonable to force Christianity upon a people, than *opium*. I think it was in this connection he remarked that, fortunately, Christianity *did not depend for its propagation on governments, treaties, nor the observance of treaties*. In illustrating how public opinion is formed and formed erroneously, he showed how very opposite were the views of our first minister, Caleb Cushing, in his dispatches at that time, to his opinions expressed in a *flowery speech* during the Burlingame visit at home."

MISSIONARIES AND THEIR CONSULS.

DEAR MR. EDITOR:—I am in receipt of the July number of the CHINESE RECORDER, and have perused with some pleasure the two replies to my article on "Missionaries and their Consuls," signed respectively "J. V. N. T." and "Arthur Chaloner." I regret that the late date at which I receive the journal has prevented my noticing these replies earlier. "J. V. N. T." in his laudable eagerness to point out the weak places in my paper, has unfortunately left as many weak places in his reply, which I will try to point out in due course. But first, I most strongly deplore the course taken by your correspondent in the earlier part of his reply. Near the beginning of his paper he says that possibly I have obtained some of my facts (or supposed facts) concerning the views and practices of missionaries from other sources than from missionaries themselves; and lower down he says *perhaps* I have heard some missionary say, &c. Now, Mr. Editor, I submit that it is not fair thus to question the

veracity of, and throw doubt broadcast over, the statements of any paper. If your correspondent can answer the paper, let him do so; but let him not resort to the strategem of weakening the paper by throwing a veil of doubt over the whole. Again, your correspondent, quoting the postscript to my paper, says, "It is a wonder that he (the writer) did not have more misgivings about the sentiments of his paper, when he found himself in such bad company." Now in quoting this postscript, your correspondent leaves out the very sentence which explains the whole, and on which the whole rests—viz., "Fas est et ab hoste doceri." I would therefore suggest that your worthy correspondent should exercise more fairness in his criticisms.

But to proceed, "J. V. N. T." in two places concedes the whole question for which in his paper he so strenuously fights. In one place he says that "if the treaty provisions are too limited, then we may go beyond them, and must go beyond them, if the providence of God only open the way, and give us the strength for the work." Now this, if it means anything, must mean that in some parts of the country missionaries must rely *only* upon the providence and strength of God for their work; so that your correspondent and I differ only in degree, not in kind. He thinks that in *some parts* of the country this should be done; I think that in *all* the Empire the same practice should be carried out. In another place, too, he argues that Scripture warrants us in applying to magistrates for the purpose of punishing evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. Undoubtedly—this I never denied; but the question is one of appealing, not to magistrates, but to Consuls. A little over two years ago, we in Hangchow were threatened with certain rumours, and an appeal to the mandarin promptly settled the matter. So that here again "J. V. N. T." only strengthens my position. But further, your correspondent says that as regards the Formosa affair I am almost as incorrect as the Duke of Somerset and the Earl of Clarendon. While thanking him for placing me in such exalted company, I would humbly suggest that he step on the same platform; for assuredly he ought to be there. Can "J. V. N. T." be ignorant of the long memorial which appeared in the CHINESE RECORDER for August last concerning the persecution in Formosa, the 1st clause in which had especial reference to troubles in Tai-wan foo, "in which city," says he, "there were no missionaries." The memorial likewise speaks of persecutions for three years past, repeated applications by different British Consuls to procure the protection of the Christians, &c., &c. The later stage of the proceedings may have borne more directly

upon the merchants, but "J. V. N. T." can hardly deny that the missionaries had a good deal to do with the matter.

Again, your correspondent says that the distinction which I make between appealing against the people to the magistrate, and appealing against an inferior to a superior magistrate, is a distinction without a difference. As your correspondent puts it, no doubt it is a distinction without a difference; but here again he has most unfairly represented the matter. The case I drew was the distinction between appealing against the people to a foreign official, and appealing against the acts of that foreign official to a higher authority, or to his own civic rights, as the case might be. Truly this distinction is marked enough. "J. V. N. T.'s" view of Consular help, as expressed near the close of his paper, is to my mind a very loose view, and savours somewhat of that casuistry which one had hoped was confined to a certain class of men in the Romish communion. He says, "It is a great mistake to represent our appeals to the Consul as an appeal to the sword. The Consul is a civil officer. Whether force in any given instance shall be employed is not to be decided by the missionary, and therefore he is not responsible. When it is decided by the proper authorities that force is necessary, none deprecate the necessity more than the missionary."

This reasoning is about as just as was that of the old Crusaders, who said that they had no desire to kill the infidels, but that if the said infidels ran against their swords, there was no help for it—they must be killed.

But to conclude, "J. V. N. T." has scarcely comprehended the meaning of the concluding sentence in my paper. The meaning is simply this—that if we regard ourselves simply as promoters of the work of missions, there is not much gained by these appeals to Consuls, which often have more to do with the advantages of foreigners, as foreigners, than with the furtherance of the gospel.

I have taken up so much of your valuable space already, that I must be very brief with the reply signed "Arthur Chaloner." This however I should in any case have been, for there is very little to call for notice. There is just one point in his paper that deserves notice. It is the first time I have heard that a missionary goes into the interior in two capacities—one as a preacher, and the other as a foreigner; one to spread the gospel, and the other to prepare the way for other foreigners (who?); and that although in his capacity as a preacher he may suffer persecution, yet in his capacity as a foreigner he must fight. This is a new doctrine, and one which I should be very sorry indeed to endorse.

It is gratifying to see how leniently your correspondents, "J. V. N. T." and "Arthur Chaloner" are inclined to treat one whom they term a "new comer;" but this desire to do so only shews their inability to distinguish between things that differ. I had thought that there was as much difference between saying that a man is a resident of no long duration, and saying that he is a "new comer," as there is between saying that a man is not very old, and saying that he is an infant.

H. G.

HANGCHOW, July 20th, 1869.

The Chinese Recorder AND MISSIONARY JOURNAL.

Rev. S. L. Baldwin, Editor.

FOOCHOW, SEPTEMBER, 1869.

BIRTHS.

At Swatow, July 25th, a daughter to WILLIAM GAULD, M. D., of the English Presbyterian Mission. (This notice was printed incorrectly in our last.)

At Canton, August 15th, a son to Rev. C. F. PRESTON, of the American Presbyterian Mission.

At Fuk-wing, August 17th, a daughter to Rev. W. LOUIS, of the Rhenish Missionary Society.

DEATH.

At Kooshan Monastery, near Foochow, August 30th, HERBERT JERMAN, infant son of Rev. S. L. and Mrs. E. E. BALDWIN, of the American Methodist Episcopal Mission, aged one month and nine days.

The August number was sent
To all ports south of Foochow, per Stmr.
Douglas, August 4th.

To all ports north of Foochow, per Stmr.
Negapatam, August 5th.

To America, per P. M. Steamer of August
19th from Shanghai.

REPLY OF REV. MR. DOUGLAS TO THE "TIMES."

A Reply to the Charges brought against Protestant Missions in China. In a Letter addressed to the "Times." By the Rev. Carstairs Douglas, M. A., Amoy, China.

In a neatly printed pamphlet of 16 pages, we have here the best answer that we have yet seen to the charges so freely uttered against missionaries in the House of Lords, and in the columns of the *Times* and other journals, when the Yangchow troubles were under discussion. Mr. Douglas, in a few trenchant paragraphs, disposes of the kind advice, so frequently urged upon missionaries by eclectic philosophers of the *Times* genus,

to combine Confucianism with Christianity, and persuade the Chinese to worship God, by indulging them in the worship of their ancestors. He also shows the utter falsity of the charge that missionaries teach the Chinese to forget their ancestors; and the absurdity of the assertion that opposition to ancestral worship by missionaries has had anything whatever to do with the violent attacks made on them in the cases recently under discussion. He shows that all that is asked by missionaries is protection from brutal violence, in the exercise of their treaty rights; and then takes up the arguments urged for refusing such protection—viz., (1) that it is detrimental to the interests of British policy, and (2) that it is inconsistent with the character of missionary enterprise. In answer to the first of these objections, it is shown that missionary work does not tend to involve the government in war, but that on the contrary, the presence of numerous missionaries in China is an influence on the side of harmony. They are generally known to be engaged in a benevolent work, and can frequently go with safety where there would be much danger to other foreigners. The fact is here mentioned, that Tseng Kwo-fan, while opposing railways and other projected improvements, nevertheless favored the toleration of missionaries, even in the interior.

The real causes of opposition to foreigners are then briefly referred to. They include the dislike of the sea-board people to the introduction of foreign ships and steamers, to the great injury of the junk trade; the annoyance of the provincial mandarins at the foreign inspectorate of customs, which cuts off their old time thievings, and while it enriches the central government, makes them "poor indeed;" the opium trade, which is felt to be ruinous to the health, the morals, and the material prosperity of the people; the coolie traffic; the report that foreigners mean to possess the empire; the supercilious treatment of the Chinese by many foreigners; the drunkenness and licentiousness of sailors, and not a few others; the introduction of foreign teachers and appliances into government schools and arsenals; and what perhaps is most important of all, and yet impossible to make understood in foreign lands—the disturbance of Fung-shuy throughout the empire.

The second objection—that the protection of missionaries is inconsistent with the character of their work—is also ably handled. Apostolic authority is quoted with effect; and the solemn agreement of the Chinese government to give such protection, it is urged, should not be suffered to become a nullity.

Mr. Dilke's letter is ably answered, and the legality of missionary residence in the interior well established. The folly of applying international law, as recognized among Christian nations to China, in its present state, is thoroughly exposed. A few other matters, connected with the subject, are incidentally noticed, and always with direct and convincing language. The whole letter impresses one as the work of a man who has truth on his side, who knows what he is talking about, and has at ready command the right words to present his ideas. Would that these same qualities might characterize the future utterances of the *Times* and other home journals on these important subjects!

It is needless to say that this letter, though addressed to the *Times*, and so well calculated to enlighten its readers on points upon which such enlightenment is sadly needed, never appeared in that journal. So much plain truth in one dose would be more than its readers could bear. It was accordingly printed in pamphlet form, with an introduction by Donald Matheson, Esq., which contains a concise and truthful statement of the various difficulties on Formosa which culminated in the capture of the fort of Amping by a British naval force, and the establishment of good relations, which continue to this day.

For the sake of truth, we hope that the pamphlet will have a large circulation.

MEDICAL MISSION WORK IN FORMOSA.

The Medical Mission Work in Formosa. Report 1867-8. By J. L. Maxwell, M. D., Edin.

This is a finely printed pamphlet of twelve pages, issued at Birmingham, and dedicated "to those Christian friends in Birmingham and elsewhere, who have generously contributed by their prayers and by their gifts to the progress of the medical mission work in Formosa." The Report being issued for circulation in Great Britain, Dr. Maxwell seems to find it necessary to argue the cause of medical missions for the benefit of those who stand in doubt of this agency, and who believe that mission work ought to be confined to the preaching of the gospel. Acknowledging that the latter should have the chief place in mission work, he urges that medical missions should be recognized as of the highest value as a coöperative agency. The arguments used are—1st, that medical missions advance scientific knowledge, and explode many of the base superstitions of the Chinese; 2nd, that they exhibit Christian

action in combination with Christian teaching; 3rd, that they are of great value in the work of disseminating the truth; 4th, that in connection with dispensary and hospital work, there is a precious field for direct labour in behalf of souls. These arguments are briefly, but thoroughly, elaborated; and sustained by facts that are familiar to all dwellers in China, though perhaps too little known at home. In concluding his argument, the Dr. says, "I believe that if a fair consideration be given to these various pleas, it will be found exceedingly difficult to escape from the conclusion that in China the medical agency is, in connection with the preaching of the gospel, a most effective instrument in the aggressive work of missions." We fully endorse this statement, except that for the words "exceedingly difficult," we would substitute the word "impossible."

The Report then notices at length the difficulties under which the mission in Formosa labored, and which were substantially rehearsed in the memorial to the British Minister published in our columns last year.

The medical mission work is represented as having assumed a much more imposing aspect than in previous years. A large hospital has been erected by the sea-side at Takao. It provides room for fifty in-patients, and has all the requisite accommodations. It is built in the style of the Chinese in Formosa—the wall of bamboo, with lath and plaster, the floors of brick, and the roof of tiles. Including the ground, it cost about £300, and is believed to be "probably the most lightsome and cheerful of all the mission hospitals in China." When the Report was written, there were from 15 to 20 inpatients. Takao being a small place, the outpatients numbered only from six to ten daily. The number of patients visited in the country probably amounted to several thousands. The in-patients in 1867 were 150, of whom no less than 59 were cases of severe ulcer of the lower extremity. Twenty-five cases of severe intermittent fever were treated in the hospital; twenty-five operations performed on the eye; five cases of acute and two of chronic rheumatism treated. One amputation was performed, in a case of extreme disease of the ankle joint.

We do not doubt that the medical work in Formosa will do much to overcome the prejudices awakened by the slanderers of the mission—a class composed mainly of yamen runners, who seem to be even more utterly vile and malicious in Formosa than on the mainland. We wish the able and zealous medical missionary all success in his truly self-denying and laborious work.

THE PEKING HOSPITAL.

The Seventh Annual Report of the Peking Hospital, in connexion with the London Missionary Society, under the care of John Dudgeon, M. D., C. M. For the Year 1868.

Dr. Dudgeon, as usual, gives us a very interesting report—not by any means confining himself to dry statistics. The total number of patients treated during the year was 13,263, of whom only 24 were in-patients—only those whose cases require operation or close attention, and those who come from a distance, being admitted into the hospital. Of the out-patients, 10,369 were males, and 2,870 females.

The diseases treated were mostly of a chronic nature; and the patients were from all the northern provinces—chiefly from Chihli, Shantung and Shansi. Many Coreans and Mongolians are also included in the list—among the latter a Mongolian prince. Mongolians, who come to Peking in the winter, apply for medicines to supply themselves and their friends until the next winter, when they return, bringing presents of fowls, rabbits, antelopes, &c.

A smaller number of opium smokers than usual applied for relief, on account of the stringent rules adopted to avoid being imposed upon by those who had no sincere desire to abandon the habit.

The general healthiness of Peking is attributed to the bracing winter climate, the comparative shortness of the hot season, and the copious supply of good water and vegetables; and this notwithstanding bad ventilation, insufficient clothing, rampant poverty, defective drainage, the utter absence of all sanitary measures, and the frequent ebullitions of anger, for which the Chinese are noted.

Many cases of unsoundness of mind come under treatment, but there are very few of a violent character.

Rupture is very frequent; and the Chinese truss, although on the same principle as the foreign, is described as "clumsy, heavy and ineffective." The Chinese sometimes treat rupture by acupuncture, under the impression that it is a collection of air.

Diseases of the eye are especially numerous, and multitudes in Peking lose their sight entirely, who might be cured by coming early to the hospital. Several bad cases of cancer and other interesting diseases are mentioned; and the Dr. grows especially eloquent over an "osteo-sarcomatous tumor of the right ankle" of a small-footed Chinese woman, to inspect which the physicians of the French and Russian legations were called in—the former of whom made a "series of beautiful

drawings"—rough wood cuts of which accompany the Report.

A formidable tumor of the right lower jaw, involving the whole of that side of the face and neck, and encroaching seriously upon the mouth and eye, was removed from a man 74 years old. Dr. Bushell assisted in the operation.

A dispensary was commenced at Tientsin in December, through the exertions of the missionaries of the London Missionary Society. At the end of two months, 900 cases had been treated; and it is hoped that eventually a medical missionary may be secured for this station.

The receipts for the year were 313 taels, 96 cents; the expenses 291 taels, 70 cents. Most of the medicines are supplied by the London Missionary Society, and their cost is not included in the above figures.

A thermometrical report shows the maximum range of the thermometer by day to have been, from 45° in February to 98° in June and July; by night, from 27° in January to 78° in June. The minimum range by day was from 22° in January to 79° in July; by night from 5° in January to 60° in July. The day average from 34° in January to 91° in July, and the night average from 15° in January to 71° in July.

The appendix contains notes on opium smoking, and on small feet, the information contained in which has already been given to our readers in the articles of Dr. Dudgeon on those subjects.

EDITORIAL ITEMS.

—Addresses were presented to the Hon. J. Ross Browne by both the British and American residents of Shanghai, prior to his departure from that port to the United States in July. These addresses expressed regret that a Minister having so correct a view of the relations of China and European nations should be recalled at this juncture, and a hope that he might greatly contribute toward the enlightenment of the public mind in the United States in regard to the real state of affairs in China. The reply of Mr. Browne to these addresses is remarkable for its thorough and comprehensive view of the relations—past, present and future—between China and foreign nations. China, its government, its policy, its true position in the scale of nations, are all estimated at their just value; and the true method of dealing with such a nation is ably pointed out. The government of the United States cannot do itself a greater honor, nor render its citizens in China and the cause,

of true progress a better service, than by returning Mr. Browne to the post he is every way so competent to fill. Now that Mr. Howard is understood to have resigned the position, we hope that Mr. Browne's return may be secured. A memorable dispatch, addressed by Mr. Browne to Prince Kung last November, is also published. Material progress, in the direction of railways, steamers, and the working of coal mines under foreign auspices, is urged with great ability; but the ears of the government seem to be shut to the language of reason and good sense, while its embassy is boasting of its civilization and progress in the courts of Europe. We would be glad to publish these able documents, but their great length and the extremely crowded state of our columns forbid.

—The press of the American Methodist Episcopal Mission at Foochow has just issued, under the auspices of the British and Foreign Bible Society, a Reference Testament. This work has been prepared by the Rev. A. W. Cribb, of the Church Missionary Society. It uses Chinese abbreviated numerals to represent the chapters and verses referred to. It will no doubt be found a very useful and popular work. The version used is that known as the Medhurst version. The Reference Testament formerly printed at the same press, and which was prepared by Rev. O. Gibson, is of the Bridgeman version, and the references are printed in Arabic figures. With the two, perhaps, all parties can be satisfied.

—We have received the middle volume of the New Testament in Mandarin colloquial, embracing the books from Romans to Philemon, inclusive. The translators will please accept our thanks for the same. We understand that they are now at work on Revelation, and that the issue of the complete New Testament may soon be expected.

—Rev. M. H. Houston has sent us a defense of slavery, in answer to the statement of "Arthur Chaloner" that slaves should not be purchased by Chinese or any other Christians, except for emancipation. Our love for free discussion is so great that we regret very much that we cannot publish Mr. Houston's communication. But we really have not space to go over the slavery discussion in the RECORDER. All the arguments advanced by Mr. H. are familiar to "Arthur Chaloner" and those who think with him; and all the arguments against slavery are no doubt familiar to Mr. Houston and those who agree with him. The whole discussion is accessible to all our readers; and if we should open our columns to republish it, our space would soon be entirely absorbed. We supposed there would be no difference of opinion in regard

to Chinese slavery, which has only two sources—the sale by parents of their own children, and the sale by kidnappers of other people's children; and that the only question would be, are the *i nü* really slaves? Perhaps we are still correct in this opinion, as Mr. H. seems rather to object to the broad statement of "Arthur Chaloner," than to his opinion in regard to Chinese slaves particularly.

—A correspondent calls attention to the fact that no hair ornament was valued at £25. in the estimate of losses by the Rev. Mr. Taylor's party at Yangchow. He seems to think that this was conceded by "Arthur Chaloner" in our June number. We have always understood that the hair ornament was only one article among many, that were estimated in the aggregate at £25. This is the true state of the case, and we think that most of our readers have had the right impression concerning it.

—Through some singular oversight the names of the members of the American Methodist Episcopal Mission at Peking were omitted from the list of Protestant Missionaries in our last number. Will our readers please add to Peking in that list—

American Methodist Episcopal Mission.

Rev. L. N. Wheeler, 1866.
Mrs. M. E. Wheeler, 1866.
Rev. H. H. Lowry, 1867.
Mrs. P. N. Lowry, 1867.

Also add to the Kalgan list, the name of
Mrs. Isabella R. Williams, 1866.

—Rev. Calvin Kingsley, D. D., one of the Bishops of the American Methodist Episcopal Church, has started on a tour around the world in the exercise of his episcopal duties. In June, he presided at the Colorado Conference; in July and August, he was to visit Oregon, Nevada and California; as this paper goes forth to our readers, he is about starting from San Francisco for Shanghai, where he expects to arrive Oct. 6th; thence he will visit the M. E. Missions in Peking and Kiukiang, and will reach Foochow in the latter part of November—where, if it seems advisable, he will organize the China Conference of the M. E. Church; thence he goes to India, and holds a Conference in the Northwest Province; thence to Constantinople, and through the mission field of his church in Bulgaria; thence through Switzerland, Germany, Denmark and Sweden to France; thence home to the United States, where he expects to arrive in time to take his part in the autumn Conferences of 1870. A pretty fair portion of "Wesley's Parish" will thus come under his observation.

MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCE

TUNG-CHAU.—Rev. L. D. Chapin writes, July 29th:—"Our work at this station is in as hopeful a state as could be expected, considering that it has been occupied less than two years. I have baptized nine adults in all, of whom eight are still church members in regular standing. I am trying to train them from the first to feel that the work is theirs even more than ours; and with a little help from persons outside the church, they are giving at the rate of about \$40 per year toward the support of a native preacher and Bible woman. Several of them have adopted the principle of giving one-tenth of their income."

NEWCHWANG.—Dr. Dudgeon writes from Peking, July 22nd:—"Wang Sien Sheng, Mr. Burns' evangelist at Newchwang, paid us a visit the other day. He came to take his wife and family to Newchwang. He was converted under the labors of Mr. Edkins, and accompanied Mr. Burns to Yingtsi in the autumn of 1857. Mr. Burns spoke of him in the highest terms; and since the lamented death of his pastor and co-labourer, Wang has been carrying forward evangelistic work very successfully under the superintendence of one of the merchants there, and aided by funds drawn from the community at Newchwang and the Irish Presbyterian Church. He is now employed by the Rev. Mr. Waddell and Dr. Hunter, the newly arrived missionaries from that church at that port. They brought with them a suitable address and testimonial from the Sabbath School of Ballymena in Ireland to Wang. The testimonial consisted of a handsome silver watch, and the address beautifully printed on card board. He values this mark of the church's esteem for him as, the companion and catechist of the late Rev. W. C. Burns, very highly, and has had it carefully translated. It will doubtless be handed down as an heirloom in his family. The circumstance is worthy of note, on account of its rarity."